

Translated Texts for Historians

300–800 AD is the time of late antiquity and the early middle ages: the transformation of the classical world, the beginnings of Europe and of Islam, and the evolution of Byzantium. TTH makes available sources translated from Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Georgian, Gothic and Armenian. Each volume provides an expert scholarly translation, with an introduction setting texts and authors in context, and with notes on content, interpretation and debates.

Editorial Committee

Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, University of Oxford
Averil Cameron, Keble College, Oxford
Marios Costambeys, University of Liverpool
Mary Cunningham, University of Nottingham
Carlotta Dionisotti, King's College, London
Peter Heather, King's College, London
Robert Hoyland, University of St Andrews
William E. Klingshirn, The Catholic University of America
Michael Lapidge, Clare College, Cambridge
John Matthews, Yale University
Neil McLynn, Corpus Christi College, Oxford
Richard Price, Heythrop College, University of London
Claudia Rapp, University of California, Los Angeles
Raymond Van Dam, University of Michigan
Michael Whitby, University of Warwick
Ian Wood, University of Leeds

General Editors

Gillian Clark, University of Bristol
Mark Humphries, Swansea University
Mary Whitby, University of Oxford

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

A full list of published titles in the Translated Texts for Historians series is available on request. The most recently published are shown below.

Bede: On Genesis

Translated with introduction and notes by CALVIN B. KENDALL
Volume 48: 371pp., 2008, ISBN 978-1-84631-088-1

Nemesius: On the Nature of Man

Translated with introduction and notes by R. W. SHARPLES and P. J. VAN DER EIJK
Volume 49: 283pp., 2008, ISBN 978-1-84631-132-1

Sources for the History of the School of Nisibis

Translated with introduction and notes by ADAM H. BECKER
Volume 50: 217pp., 2008, ISBN 978-1-84631-161-1

Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553:

with related texts on the Three Chapters Controversy

Translated with an introduction and notes by RICHARD PRICE
Volume 51: 2 vols, 384pp + 360pp, 2009, ISBN 9781846311789

Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian: Agapetus – Advice to the Emperor, Dialogue on Political Science, Paul the Silentiary – Description of Hagia Sophia

Translated with notes and an introduction by PETER N. BELL
Volume 52: 249pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-209-0

History and Hagiography from the Late Antique Sinai

DANIEL F. CANER, with contributions by SEBASTIAN BROCK, RICHARD M. PRICE and KEVIN VAN BLADEL
Volume 53: 346pp, ISBN 978-1-84631-216-8

Orosius: Seven Books of History against the Pagans

Translated with introduction and notes by A. T. FEAR
Volume 54: 456pp., 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-473-5 cased, 978-1-84631-239-7 limp

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor: Church and War in Late Antiquity

Translated by GEOFFREY GREATREX, with ROBERT PHENIX and CORNELIA HORN; introductory material by SEBASTIAN BROCK and WITOLD WITAKOWSKI
Volume 55: forthcoming 2010; ISBN 978-1-84631-493-3 cased, 978-1-84631-494-0 limp

Bede: On the Nature of Things and On Times

Translated with introduction and notes by CALVIN B. KENDALL and FAITH WALLIS
Volume 56: 371pp., 2010, ISBN 978-1-84631-495-7

For full details of Translated Texts for Historians, including prices and ordering information, please write to the following:

All countries, except the USA and Canada: Liverpool University Press, 4 Cambridge Street, Liverpool, L69 7ZU, UK (*Tel* +44-[0]151-794 2233, *Fax* +44-[0]151-794 2235, Email J.M. Smith@liv.ac.uk, <http://www.liverpool-unipress.co.uk>). **USA and Canada:** University of Chicago Press, 1427 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL, 60637, US (*Tel* 773-702-7700, *Fax* 773-702-9756, www.press.uchicago.edu)

Translated Texts for Historians
Volume 55

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor

Church and War in Late Antiquity

GEOFFREY GREATREX

translated from Syriac and Arabic sources by

ROBERT R. PHENIX and CORNELIA B. HORN

with introductory material by

SEBASTIAN BROCK and WITOLD WITAKOWSKI

Liverpool
University
Press



First published 2011
Liverpool University Press
4 Cambridge Street
Liverpool, L69 7ZU

Copyright © 2011 Geoffrey Greatrex, Cornelia Horn and Robert Phenix

The authors' rights have been asserted in accordance with
the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or
by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording,
or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A British Library CIP Record is available.

ISBN 978-1-84631-493-3 cased
978-1-84631-494-0 limp

Set in Times by
Koinonia, Manchester
Printed in the European Union by
Bell and Bain Ltd, Glasgow

CONTENTS

Preface	viii
Acknowledgements	x
Abbreviations	xii

Introduction

A General overview	1
B Zachariah of Mytilene	3
(1) Life and career	3
(2) Works	12
(i) The <i>Life of Isaiah</i> and a <i>Life of Peter the Iberian</i>	13
(ii) A <i>Vita Paralii</i>	14
(iii) <i>Ammonius</i> or <i>De mundi opificio (disputatio)</i>	14
(iv) The <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> [see (3) below]	15
(v) The <i>Life of Severus</i>	15
(vi) <i>Capita vii contra Manichaeos</i>	18
(vii) The <i>Antirrhesis (Adversus Manichaeos)</i>	19
(3) His <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	19
(i) Introduction	19
(ii) Composition and nature of the work	20
(iii) Sources	23
(iv) The relation between PZ and Zach.'s <i>HE</i>	25
(v) Conclusion	29
C Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene	32
(1) Pseudo-Zachariah himself	32
(2) The work of PZ	33
(3) PZ's sources	39
(i) The <i>Ecclesiastical History of Zachariah of Mytilene</i>	39
(ii) A chronicle	40
(iii) Bishop lists	43
(iv) Church historians	45
(v) Written records of church councils	46

(vi) Dossiers of correspondence	46
(vii) Self-standing accounts	47
(viii) An account of the reign of Anastasius	54
(ix) A Justinianic source, covering books viii–x	55
(x) An apocalyptic source	56
(4) The transmission of PZ	57
(5) PZ's literary style and interests (R.P., C.H.)	60
(6) The manuscript basis of PZ, editions, translations and research to date (W.W., revised by G.G.)	62
(7) Conclusion	65
D Historical introduction	66
E Text and translation	73
F Analysis and partial translation of books i–ii (S.B., with some additions by G.G.)	75

The Chronicle of Pseudo-Zachariah Rhetor

Book iii	95
Book iv	130
Book v	172
Book vi	210
Book vii	227
Book viii	279
Book ix	313
Book x	397
Book xii	425

Appendices

1 Works circulating in the early sixth century about the council of Chalcedon	456
2 Emperors and patriarchs, 440–565	459
Glossary	461

Maps

1 Constantinople and its environs	467
2 Osrhoene and Mesopotamia	468
3 The eastern frontier	469
4 The frontier south of the Tur Abdin	470

CONTENTS

vii

5	The Near East	471
6	Monasteries of the East (cf. PZ viii.5)	472
7	Peoples of the Caucasus (Hewsen 2001, map 68)	473
8	Peoples of the Caucasus (Land 1887)	474
	Acknowledgements for the maps	475
	Bibliography	476

Indices

Biblical and apocryphal citations	524
References to <i>CPG</i>	529
Persons and places mentioned in xii.4	530
General index	535

PREFACE

Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene is certainly not a household name. Yet in any account of the reigns of Zeno, Anastasius, Justin I or Justinian, his work will be cited, probably on numerous occasions, in footnotes and endnotes, for his account is one of the most extensive on this period, frequently providing information unattested in other sources. As we discuss below (section C [7]), important episodes in sixth-century history, such as the dramatic fall of patriarch Macedonius in 511, might well have remained unknown to modern scholars without his narrative. We hope by this new translation and commentary to make his work more accessible, even if Hamilton and Brooks' English translation of 1899 may already be found on-line. More importantly, we hope to help scholars and students assess his work and be able to follow the thread of his narrative more easily. In order to facilitate comprehension and reference we have therefore subdivided the chapters into sections: we must stress that these sections are our own creation and not attested anywhere in any manuscripts.¹ For the sake of simplicity we also refer to the initial section of each book, in which the contents are described, as chapter 0.

It is worth contrasting the fate of Pseudo-Zachariah with that of his approximate contemporary Evagrius. The latter church historian, writing in Greek in Constantinople soon after 593/4, has benefited from a great deal of scholarly attention in recent years, from Pauline Allen's commentary of 1981 to an Italian translation of 1998, an English translation (with commentary) of 2000, and most recently a German translation in 2007. By contrast, Pseudo-Zachariah – or at any rate his *Ecclesiastical History* –, as we note below, has been subject to very little scrutiny, although one should make an honourable exception of the work of Josef Rist and Philippe Blaudeau, while the monograph of Muriel Debié on Syriac historiography, which will appear around the same time as this work, will no doubt shed important light

¹ The book and chapter divisions may well go back to PZ himself, as Kugener 1900b, 203, suggests (again for the sake of the reader).

on our author. It is our hope therefore to spur on research on this important writer (or rather, compiler) by our translation and commentary.

One final point remains to be underlined. This is not a full translation and commentary; nor were its predecessors in 1899. For this they attracted some criticism, as indeed we suspect that ours too may. With some reluctance, we have omitted most of the first two books, which amount to nearly 150 pages of Syriac text, approximately one quarter of the whole work. We shall discuss them below in our introduction, but we should note here that our decision to leave most of this section out results from several considerations. First, they are of a very disparate nature and of marginal use to the historian: most of them are Syriac versions of legendary tales, such as that of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus or of the (legendary) baptism of Constantine, which may be found in several other languages.² Second, to include these two initial books would have required expertise beyond that of the present writers, as well as resulting in an extremely long volume (or volumes). Third, it is our understanding that others – more expert than us – are engaged in working on these chapters and should bring out their translations and commentaries in due course. Fourth, we recognise that certain chapters in the first two books, e.g. i.1, ii.0, ii.2–4, are of greater importance to the historian, and we have therefore included these here in a translation by Sebastian Brock, alongside summaries of the remaining chapters of the first two books (section F below). Naturally books xi and the opening chapters of xii are absent, having been lost at an early stage. Nevertheless, to conclude on a more positive note, we have included a full translation of x.16 and xii.7, both of which were omitted in the publications of 1899.

2 Rist 2002, 85–6, cites approvingly Allen's (1980, 473) description of them as a 'medley'.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A work of this scale requires the assistance of many scholars of very diverse fields. Many have given generously of their time and expertise in answering obscure questions relating to Pseudo-Zachariah. Among them we should like to thank particularly Jonathan Bardill (Nottingham), Franz Alto Bauer (Munich University), Philippe Blaudeau (Paris XII), Phil Booth (Trinity College, Oxford), Richard Burgess (University of Ottawa), Kevin Casey (University of Toronto), Ian Colvin (Cambridge), Simon Corcoran (University College, London), Dominique Côté (University of Ottawa), Muriel Debié (CNRS, Paris), Jitse Dijkstra (University of Ottawa), Hugh Elton (Trent University), Jan van Ginkel (Leiden), Helen Hardman (London), Amir Harrak (University of Toronto), Nicholas de Lange (Cambridge University), Christopher Lillington-Martin (Wellington), Cyril and Marlia Mango (Oxford University), Sergei Mariev (Munich University), Mischa Meier (Tübingen University), Volker Menze (Central European University, Budapest), Fergus Millar (Oxford University), Pierluigi Piovaneli (University of Ottawa), Philip Rance (Munich University), Josef Rist (Bochum University), Benet Salway (University College, London), Peter Sarris (Trinity College, Cambridge), Sacha Stern (University College, London), Iuliana Viezure (University of Toronto), Witold Witakowski (Uppsala University). Michael Whitby (University of Warwick), Mary Whitby (Oxford University) and Sebastian Brock (Oxford University) made important comments on earlier drafts. Witold Witakowski supplied us with an unpublished paper on Pseudo-Zachariah, part of which forms the basis for section C (6) below. Ann Clayton kindly provided the cover illustration. Pauline Allen (Australian Catholic University) deserves particular thanks for initiating contact between G.G. and R.P. and C.H. at a critical moment in the project. To them and to others we have omitted to mention we are most grateful. Needless to say, they are not responsible for the errors that remain.

It is a pleasure equally to acknowledge the funding bodies that have allowed this work to come into existence. It owes a great deal to the Alexander von

Humboldt-Stiftung. Not only did the foundation fund a six-month sabbatical for me at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität in Munich in the first half of 2006, but it also supported a three-month stay there in early 2009. One could hardly hope for more congenial surroundings in which to carry out research. Half a dozen excellent libraries lie within an easy walking distance of the Internationales Begegnungszentrum (IBZ), where I had the pleasure to stay on both occasions. Among them I should single out that of the Institut für Semitistik (now the Institut für den Nahen und Mittleren Osten [Judaistik and Arabistik], sadly shorn of its chair in Syriac studies), that of the Historicum, and of course the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. It was to the Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies that I was attached during this time, and I am most grateful to my academic host, Professor Albrecht Berger, for his hospitality and readiness to answer questions on any topic conceivable. It owes much too to the Social Sciences and Humanities and Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), which provided vital funding for the project, allowing me to attend various conferences and to confer with my collaborators in St Louis. I am also happy to thank Robinson College, Cambridge, where I spent a very enjoyable term as a Bye fellow in the first three months of 2009. Last, but not least, I must thank my mother, who put me up for long periods in Cambridge over these years, listened to my musings on Pseudo-Zachariah, and frequently made valuable suggestions.

G.G.

First, we must express our thanks to Geoffrey Greatrex for inviting us to participate in this project, and to Sebastian Brock for the many important suggestions and corrections to our Syriac translation. The preliminary translation was completed in January of 2009. The final pieces of the revised translation were delivered in June 2009. With the help of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at Saint Louis University, particularly Prof. Tom Madden, Director, and Ms. Theresa Harvey, the Center's coordinator, Geoffrey came to Saint Louis in September 2008 to present his work on Patriarch Macedonius of Constantinople and the day-by-day reports of his ousting from office narrated in this volume. We express our gratitude to Mr Aaron Overby, who contributed to the production of this volume in a personal capacity, and to Mr Tomás O'Sullivan of Bantry, who, among other favours, drove Geoffrey to and from the airport on his visit.

R.P., C.H.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ACO* *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, edd. E. Schwartz et al., 4 vols. Berlin–Leipzig 1922–74; ser.2, ed. R. Riedinger. Berlin 1984–.
- AG* Annus Graecorum, i.e. a date in the Seleucid era, starting on 1 October 312 B.C.
- AK* K. Ahrens and G. Krüger, tr., *Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor*. Leipzig 1899.
- BHG* F. Halkin, ed., *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, 3rd ed. Brussels 1957.
- BHL* *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*. Brussels 1898–1901, repr. 1949.
- BHO* P. Peeters, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis*. Brussels 1910.
- CAH* *Cambridge Ancient History*
- CCC* J. Stevenson, rev. W. Frend, *Creeds, Councils and Controversies. Documents illustrating the history of the Church, A.D. 337–461*. London 1989.
- CCSG* *Corpus Christianorum, series graeca*. Turnhout 1977–.
- CCSL* *Corpus Christianorum, series latina*. Turnhout 1953–.
- CE* *Codex Encyclius* in *ACO* ii.5, pp. 9–98.
- CPG* *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, ed. M. Geerard, 5 vols. Turnhout 1974–87, 2nd ed., 2003–.
- CHEIA* Sinor, D., ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*. Cambridge 1990.
- CSCO* *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium*. Louvain 1903–.
- CSEL* *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. Vienna 1866–.
- CSHB* *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae byzantinae*. Bonn 1828–97.
- DHGE* *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*. Paris 1912–.
- EEC* E. Ferguson, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed. London 1997.
- EP* *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition, 11 vols. Leiden 1960–2002.
- Elr* *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. London 1982–.
- ESCO* *Enciclopedia dei Santi. Le chiese orientali*, ed. L. Velardi, 2 vols. Rome 1998.
- FCH* R.C. Blockley, ed. and tr., *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, 2 vols. Liverpool 1981–3.
- FHG* *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, vols. 4–5. ed. C. Müller. Paris 1851–70.

GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. Berlin 1897–.
HB	F.W. Hamilton and E.W. Brooks, tr., <i>The Ecclesiastical History of Ps.-Zachariah of Mitylene</i> . London 1899.
HEO	<i>Hierarchia Ecclesiastica Orientalis</i> , G. Fedalto, 2 vols. Padua 1988.
JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JCSSS	<i>Journal of the Canadian Society for Syriac Studies</i>
LThK	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i> , ed. W. Kasper et al., 3rd edition, 11 vols. Freiburg 1993–2001.
LTUR	<i>Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae</i> , ed. M. Steinby, 6 vols. Rome 1993– 2000.
LXX	<i>Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum</i> . Göttingen 1931–.
MGH AA	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi</i> . Berlin 1877– 1919.
MS A	manuscript BL Add. 17,202, the principal manuscript for Pseudo-Zachariah's work.
MS C	manuscript BL Add. 12,154.
MS V	manuscript Vat. Syr. 145.
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. Kazhdan, 3 vols. Oxford 1991.
ODCC	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i> , 3rd ed., ed. F.L. Cross, rev. E.A. Livingstone. Oxford 1997.
OCA	<i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</i> . Rome 1935–.
OrSuec	<i>Orientalia Suecana</i>
PCBE	C. and L. Pietri, eds, <i>Prosopographie chrétienne du bas-empire</i> , vol. 2, <i>Italie (313–604)</i> , 2 vols. Rome 1999–2000.
PD	see Ps. Dion. below under primary sources.
PLRE	<i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , vols. 2–3, ed. J.R. Martin-dale. Cambridge 1980–92.
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1857–1912.
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1841–1864.
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i> , ed. F. Nau and R. Graffin. Paris 1907–.
PS	<i>Publizistische Sammlungen</i> , see under primary sources.
PZ	Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene
PZT	Brooks' edition of PZ: see Pseudo-Zachariah under primary sources.
PZV	Brooks' translation of PZ: see Pseudo-Zachariah under primary sources.
RE	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
RHE	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique</i>
RSCC	P.R. Coleman-Norton, <i>Roman State and Christian Church</i> , 3 vols. London 1966.

SC	Sources Chrétiennes. Paris 1944–.
<i>StPat</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i> , Berlin, then Louvain, 1957–.
<i>TRE</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> , 36 vols. Berlin 1977–2004.
TTH	Translated Texts for Historians. Liverpool 1986–.
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig 1882–.
Zach.	Zachariah of Mytilene, author of books iii–vi of PZ (in Greek, now lost)

INTRODUCTION

A. GENERAL OVERVIEW

Pseudo-Zachariah's (henceforth PZ) work is a complex and composite one. This introduction is in consequence somewhat lengthy and intricate. We have sought to render it more user-friendly by breaking it up into a large number of sections and sub-sections, in order that the reader may more easily find topics of interest to him or her. Since the core of the work is a Syriac version of the (originally Greek) *Ecclesiastical History* of Zachariah of Mytilene, we have opted to start by discussing this part in detail (section B below). In A.D. 568/9 a disparate collection of accounts, some legendary, most of considerable historical value, was grafted onto this core, and we seek to analyse them and their provenance in section C. We continue our introduction with a brief historical overview of the period (section D), followed by a few remarks on our translation and commentary (section E). The last section of the introduction is a bridge to the rest of the work, comprising a translation by Sebastian Brock of the most important chapters, from a historian's perspective, to be found in the first two books (section F).

Table 1 (over) offers a summary of the work and where the various sections are discussed and translated.

2 THE CHRONICLE OF PSEUDO-ZACHARIAH RHETOR

Table 1

<i>Section</i>	<i>Contents</i>	<i>Translation</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Ref. to discussion in intro.</i>
i.1	Introduction	75	n/a	F
i.2–3	Genealogies	n/a	Uncertain	C 3 (vi)(a)
i.4–6	Joseph and Aseneth	n/a	Moses of Ingilene	C 3 (vi)(b), (vii)(a)
i.7	Baptism of Constantine	n/a	Uncertain	C 3 (vii)(b)
i.8	Discovery of relics of St Stephen	n/a	Uncertain	C 3 (vii)(c)
i.9	Isaac and Dodo	81	n/a	F
ii.1	Seven Sleepers of Ephesus	n/a	Uncertain	C (3)(vii)(d)
ii.2–4	Church history, 448–9	84	Socr., council acts	C (3)(iv–v)
ii.5	Letter of Proclus	n/a	(Letter itself)	C (3)(vi)(c)
	Secular events 438–450	91	Chronicle	C (3)(ii)
iii	Reign of Marcian (450–457)	95	Zach. Myt.	C (3)(i)
iv	Reign of Leo (457–474)	130	Zach. Myt.	C (3)(i)
v–vi	Reigns of Zeno (474–491) and Basiliscus (475–6)	172	Zach. Myt.	C (3)(i)
vii	Reign of Anastasius (491–518)	227	Anastasian source	C (3)(viii)
viii	Reign of Justin (518–527)	277	Justinianic source	C (3)(ix)
ix	Reign of Justinian, first part (527–536/7)	311	Justinianic source	C (3)(ix)
x	Reign of Justinian, second part (536/7–?), fragmentary	395	Justinianic source	C (3)(ix)
x.16	Description of Rome	417	Not. Urbis Romae	C (3)(vii)(j)
xi–xii.3	Uncertain (not extant)	n/a	n/a	n/a
xii.4–5	Signs of the end of the world	423	Apocalyptic source	C (3)(x)
xii.6	Amidene events in 550s	427	Justinianic source	C (3)(ix)
xii.7a–j	Description of the world	429	Ptolemy	C (3)(vii)(k)
xii.7k–q	Caucasian affairs	444	Oral source	C (3)(vii)(k)

B. ZACHARIAH OF MYTILENE

(1) Life and career

But it wounds me deeply that, because your soul has been smitten with divine love, it should conceive the idea of adopting the philosophic and solitary life, though it is living in a philosophic manner and has within that which it seeks as if it were at a distance... How then can you, when the emperor [Anastasius] is pious, flee from the fight with the heretics, instigated as you are by a God-loving thought, and refusing to endure blasphemies, and looking at this only, and reckoning our nakedness as nothing? [...] Further also a story like this has been conveyed to us by those who have grown old in asceticism. In the times of the Arians, two men who lived in the philosophic manner remained in the desert, and in the unsocial life. And, when the word of truth was being attacked, and was being obscured by heretical craftiness of speech, and they were called to give help (for they had in fact qualifications for fighting on behalf of piety), they were disinclined to do so, because they clung to philosophy, and action seemed to them irksome. And the one put constraint upon himself, and showed more respect to the commandment than to the peace that he loved, and hastily set off to take part in the contests, and obeyed those who called him. But the other remained according to his pleasure in the desert, and the spirits of evil came and assailed him with greater vehemence, and he became possessed of the feeling that he had been stripped of God's grace and help, and was in danger of being devoured by fiends as it were by lions; and he was awakened and reflected upon his thoughtlessness, and he changed his mind and immediately followed his brother's resolution, and took a hand with him in the contests on behalf of the faith.¹

Although these words were addressed by the patriarch Severus to the *cubicularius* Misael, rather than Zachariah, it is highly likely that he offered similar advice to his schoolfriend and mentor. As we shall see, Zachariah even dedicated a work to Misael, with whom he was evidently well acquainted. For our historian, despite the attraction that the monastic life exercised on him, never followed in Severus' footsteps nor in those of many of his other companions from school and university. His skills, like those of the two solitaries mentioned by Severus, lay rather in argument and polemic, and it is to these that he devoted his literary career.

Zachariah's life and works have been the subject of considerable scholarly discussion. The reason for this stems from the fact that different sources refer to him by a variety of titles, such as Zachariah *scholasticus*, Zachariah the rhetor and Zachariah, the bishop of Mytilene. Scholars have therefore examined these various references in detail in order to determine whether

1 Sev., *Lett.*, ep. x.11 (517–19/460–2), tr. Brooks, to the *cubicularius* Misael, dated 513/518.

these figures are all one and the same person. The consensus now is that they are, and so we do not propose to go over this ground again.²

We are unusually well informed about Zachariah's life, or at any rate his early life, thanks to information with which he provides us himself in his *Life of Severus*. From this work it emerges that he was born in Maiuma, the harbour city of Gaza, in the late 460s. He was from a well-to-do Christian family and no doubt will have received a thorough grounding in rhetoric, literature and grammar in his native city as a youth: Gaza was a flourishing centre of education in this period, boasting a number of renowned figures whose works have survived to the present day, such as Procopius of Gaza and Choricus. It is even possible, though by no means certain, that the historian Procopius of Caesarea may also have received part of his training at the Gaza school.³ One of the notable characteristics of the Gaza school was its blending of pagan and Christian themes: in the same work allusions to both pagan myths and Christian topics may be found. Procopius of Gaza, for instance, a contemporary of Zachariah, composed both secular panegyrics and biblical commentaries.⁴ Although at Gaza there had earlier been

2 Honigmann 1953c covers the ground thoroughly, refuting successfully the more sceptical approach of Kugener 1900b, 201–4, cf. idem 1900a, 467. See also Wegenast 1967, Minniti Colonna 1973, 15–26, Allen 1980, 471–2, Rist 1998, idem 2002, 78–81, di Berardino 2006, 266–7, Blaudeau 2006a, 546. Friend 1972, 202 n.5, is a rare dissenting voice, preferring to distinguish several Zachariahs because of the apparent differences in their doctrinal outlook. As Blaudeau notes, Honigmann's proposed identification of Zachariah with a brother of Procopius of Gaza has not been generally accepted, cf. Minniti Colonna 1973, 18–20; Treadgold 2007, 166, however, assumes the relation without argument. The two terms, rhetor and *scholasticus*, were both associated with lawyers and are applied to many historians of the period. See Wallraff 1997, 216 and n.34 (stressing the very general nature of the latter term), Minniti Colonna 1973, 16–17, Greatrex 2001b, 150–1 nn.14–15 (on the former term).

3 Downey 1963 is an excellent evocation of the city in this period, see esp. 107–16 on the School and its representatives. He argues, 112, that the historian Procopius studied there, cf. Greatrex 1996b (more sceptical). See also Minniti Colonna 1973, 20–1, di Berardino 2006, 257–72, Saliou 2007a and b. Rist 1998, 303, puts Zachariah's birth in 465/6, cf. Kaldellis 2002, 160, Watts 2005a, 445; Blaudeau 2006a, 547, prefers c.468, cf. ibid. 548 n.287 for a detailed discussion of the chronology of Zachariah's early life. He is rightly sceptical of Kugener's placing of Zachariah's birth as late as 470 (Kugener 1900b, 209), a date accepted by Treadgold 2007, 166. Athanassiadi 1999, 350–7, proposes associating the historian Zosimus (writing c.500) with Gaza likewise, identifying him with a sophist referred to in the Suda.

4 Downey 1963, 109–11, Chuvin 1990, 115–17, cf. Athanassiadi 1999, 297 n.348 and Flusin 2005, xi. See *PLRE* ii, Procopius 8, on Procopius of Gaza, putting his birth in c.465. On the city of Gaza itself in this period see Gucker 1987, 51–4, Saliou 2000. Several contributions in Saliou 2005 concern the Gaza school and Choricus (of Gaza) in particular. See also Flusin 1996, 32–4, on this milieu and the fusion of secular and ecclesiastical in Zachariah's works.

some resistance to Christianity, Maiuma, on the other hand, had long been a bastion of the new faith.⁵ In the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, at which the two natures of Christ, human and divine, were sharply distinguished, a wave of resistance in Palestine and Egypt was unleashed. At Maiuma a new bishop was appointed by the anti-Chalcedonians, Peter the Iberian, a prince from the Caucasus region, who had been residing in the city hitherto as a holy man. His tenure lasted only about two years, 453–455, when he was obliged to take refuge in Egypt. Although he returned to Palestine in 475, he did not visit Maiuma, where opponents of Chalcedon appear to have been in the minority.⁶ These tumultuous events are the background to Zachariah's childhood as well as forming the subject of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

Some time after 484, probably in 485, Zachariah left Gaza for Alexandria to continue his education, a common path for students from the city.⁷ He attended courses in both rhetoric and philosophy and became involved in a group of students known as the Philoponoi, i.e. the lovers of labours. These students were zealous Christians, keen to refute the pagan views that were still so prevalent in the schools of Alexandria among both teachers and pupils. In his *Life of Severus* Zachariah provides a vivid description of the activities of the Philoponoi and how they won several victories over their pagan rivals. The most detailed concerns a certain Paralius, a disillusioned pagan who converted to Christianity, who then brought about the destruction of a pagan shrine at Menuthis, just outside Alexandria, with the assistance of the patriarch, Peter Mongus, and the monks.⁸ It was also in Alexandria that Zachariah came to know the future patriarch of Antioch, Severus. He was impressed by his intelligence and persuaded him to take up reading

5 Downey 1963, 14–32, Van Dam 1985, 10, 17–19, Chuvín 1990, 76–8 with Trombley 1993, 187–245, on conflicts between pagans and Christians c.400. On Maiuma see Horn 2006, 89 and n.189. The house of Zachariah's father, as she notes (*ibid.* 45), lay close to the monastery of Peter the Iberian (on which see below), *V. Sev.* 88. Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006, 47, offer a good map of the area around Gaza and its monasteries.

6 See Horn 2006, 89–111, eadem 2003, cf. Steppa 2005, 15–24.

7 See Cribiore 2007, 56–7, on the close links between Alexandria and Gaza, cf. Glucker 1987, 51, Watts 2010, 130–1. Athanassiadi 1999, 350–7, argues that the historian Zosimus also proceeded from Gaza to Alexandria. For Zach.'s arrival in Alexandria in 485 see (e.g.) Krüger 1908, 594, Rist 2005, 335.

8 *V. Sev.* 14–46. The episode has been the focus of much scholarly attention. See (e.g.) Frend 1972, 203–4, Chuvín 1990, 105–11, Trombley 1994, 4–20, Haas 1997, 327–9, Blázquez 1998, Athanassiadi 1999, 24–9 and (2)(e) below. On the Philoponoi see Haas 1997, 238–40, Watts 2006, 213–16. Watts 2006, 216 n.71, dates the Paralius episode to 486; cf. idem 2010, 263–4.

the works of the church fathers alongside those of pagan authors such as Libanius.⁹ For his part, Severus was also taken with the dynamic young Zachariah. He gave great praise to a funeral address Zachariah delivered in honour of the ascetic Christian Menas, a fellow member of the Philoponoi, an address that Zachariah had very nearly been unable to give, so gravely had he been ill. Our historian's own recovery, he tells us, in the wake of the destruction of the pagan idols of Menuthis, further dismayed the already despondent pagans.¹⁰

Severus, who no doubt had arrived in Alexandria before Zachariah, left to study law at Berytus (Beirut), probably in 487. Zachariah, meanwhile, spent a further year in Alexandria, wishing to deepen his knowledge of his pagan adversaries, the better to be able to refute them. In the following year he followed in Severus' wake, intending to study law at Berytus and thus to fulfil his father's ambitions for him.¹¹ Here he embarked on an intensive study of the law, a programme that lasted at least four years, usually five. It was, however, a passport to a career in the imperial administration, promising a good salary and prospects. Many other literary figures took the same route, among whom we might mention the church historian Sozomen and the secular historian Procopius of Caesarea.¹² Berytus was one of the few cities in which one could pursue a training in the law: Constantinople was its only serious rival in the eastern empire at this time. It was a pleasant port city, offering the students many distractions, such as games, public spectacles and brothels. As at Alexandria, the university professors were many of them pagans, and paganism remained popular among much of the

9 *V. Sev.* 10–13. Some scholars place Severus' birth in c.456 (see e.g. Allen and Hayward 2004, 5, Torrance in *LThK* 31 [2000], 184), while others prefer c.465 (e.g. T.E. Gregory in *ODB*, 1884, Frend 1972, 202). Wegenast 1967, 2212, supposes that Severus was older than Zachariah, which is the impression that the *V. Sev.* gives. The fact remains that Severus left Alexandria one year before Zachariah, which would tend to imply that he was at least marginally older than his biographer. We shall return to Severus when discussing the *V. Sev.*

10 *V. Sev.* 44–5, with Watts 2010, 11, 145–7.

11 Blázquez 1998, 416, erroneously supposes the two to have gone to Berytus simultaneously. See Allen and Hayward 2004, 6, for the dating adopted here, which can only be approximate, cf. Wegenast 1967, 2212. Watts 2005a, 445, places Zachariah's arrival in Berytus in 489, Rist 2005, 340, places it in 488, Blaudeau 2006a, 547–8, prefers 487, cf. Kugener 1900b, 205–6, Krüger 1908, 594. On his father's ambitions for his legal career, *V. Sev.* 95.

12 See Blaudeau 2006a, 547–8, on the length of studies, with Collinet 1925, 223–40; cf. MacAdam 2001–2, 208 (arguing for five years), Kugener 1900b, 206, Poggi 1986, 60. For this means of advancing one's fortunes, especially for historians, see Greatrex 2001b, 150–1, cf. 157–9, citing other cases of historians with a legal background. See also Millar 2006, 88–9.

student body.¹³ Zachariah, of course, eschewed the city's entertainments, preferring to frequent the churches of the Resurrection (Anastasis) and that of the God-bearer (Theotokos) in the port, the former of which features in both his dialogue *Ammonius* and in his *Ecclesiastical History*.¹⁴ As one might expect, Zachariah swiftly set about countering this pagan atmosphere and building a group of like-minded Christian students around him. He and his group, of which Severus, as yet unbaptised, was not an active member, exploited a bungled attempt at a human sacrifice to oblige a leading pagan, John the Fuller, to burn his books of magic and convert to Christianity.¹⁵ They followed this up with a confrontation with a professor of law, Leontius, as a result of a report that reached them of another pagan asking a scribe to copy a magic text. A tense situation in the city resulted, leading to battles in the streets, which was eventually calmed by Leontius' surrender and the handing-over of his works of magic.¹⁶

It was while at Berytus that Zachariah began his literary career. In the *Life of Severus* he mentions that he composed at this time biographies of Peter the Iberian and the ascetic holy man Isaiah, both leading lights of the anti-Chalcedonian monastic movement who had lived near Maiuma. Around the same time, c.490, Severus was baptised at Tripolis by the holy man Evagrius, but returned to complete his legal studies at Berytus. Both Severus and Zachariah were then coming towards the end of their programme of studies. Members of their group were dispersing and, in several cases, opted to join Peter the Iberian's monastic community near Maiuma. Severus himself, despite his initial reluctance, took the same path a little later and established himself at a separate monastery not far from Peter's. Not long before this, however, the aged Peter died.¹⁷ A new generation of anti-Chalcedonians was

13 Jones Hall 2004, 108–10, 163–4, ch.9, offers a good portrait of the city in this period, cf. Chuvin 1990, 112–15, Blázquez 1998, 426–8, Liebeschuetz 2001, 1039–41. *V. Sev.* 51 on the distractions that abounded in the city, cf. Trombley 1994, 31, MacAdam 2001–2, 214–15. It is possible that legal studies were also pursued at Caesarea (Palestine) and Alexandria at this time, but the evidence is limited: see Cribiore 2007, 57.

14 *V. Sev.* 48 on the churches, cf. *Ammonius* 48–72 and PZ iv.9b.

15 *V. Sev.* 58–63, cf. Trombley 1994, 33–8. See also Watts 2005a, 446.

16 *V. Sev.* 63–70, followed by another episode in which pagans are deceived by other pagan charlatans into hunting in vain for buried treasure, 70–5. See Trombley 1994, 38–45, MacAdam 2001–2, 215–18.

17 The chronology is uncertain in the details. Peter the Iberian died in 491, cf. Horn 2006, 106, Blaudeau 2006a, 548. Horn 2006, 109, puts Severus' baptism in 488 and his joining the monastery (implicitly) in c.492, after Peter's death, cf. *V. Sev.* 75–86 on all these events and Zach.'s compositions (at p.83). See also Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006, 33. Allen and Hayward 2004, 7, put the start of his monastic career in c.490, which must be wrong, since it

coming to the fore, and prominent among them was Zachariah. Yet while other figures, such as John Rufus, another former student at Berytus and author of the collection of anti-Chalcedonian anecdotes, the *Plerophoriae* and of a *Life of Peter the Iberian*, and Theodore of Ascelon, as well as Severus himself, all embraced the monastic life, Zachariah did not.¹⁸ He and Severus spent a final year at law school together, probably in 491–2, after which they set off on a journey to Tripolis, where Severus had been baptised, and next to Emesa, where they saw the head of John the Baptist. Their paths then diverged. While Severus, having visited Jerusalem, determined to embark on a monastic career, Zachariah, under pressure from his father, headed for Constantinople to practise law.¹⁹

Henceforth it becomes more difficult to track Zachariah's career. In the early 490s he brought out his philosophical dialogue, the *Ammonius*, otherwise known as *De mundi opificio* ('on the creation of the world'), a work he later revised and updated in Constantinople, probably in the early 520s.²⁰ It is a work that looks back to his days in Alexandria and offers a vigorous rebuttal of pagan, and more particularly Aristotelian, arguments for the eternity of the world; it is especially critical of the philosopher Ammonius, with whom he had studied and who is bested in several debates in the work.

clearly followed Peter the Iberian's death. On Peter's monastery near Maiuma see the detailed analysis of Horn 2006, 206–14.

18 *V. Sev.* 85–95, offering details of the fate of many of Zachariah's circle, often otherwise unknown, cf. *Vit. Petr. Iber.* 105/77–8 and *Joh. Ruf. Pleroph.* 70 (p.125), mentioning Zach., with Horn 2003, 117–20 and Watts 2010, 128–30 on the attraction exercised by the monastic life on students; she attributes it at least in part to Peter's travels in Palestine towards the end of his life; see also Steppa 2005, 20 and Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006, 28–9. Theodore (of Ascelon) and John the Canopite took over Peter's monastery upon his death, although John Rufus was also involved. See Horn 2006, 210. On John's work see Flusin 1996, 30–1, Whitby 2003, 455–8, Steppa 2005, 57–81, Horn 2006, 12–43. Zach. felt keenly his inability to follow the example of his peers, but he tells us that he was consoled in his decision by letters from Evagrius (the godfather of Severus) and Aeneas (of Gaza), the sophist, *V. Sev.* 90. His brother, Stephanus, having studied literature and medicine, also opted for the monastic life, together with Paralius, *V. Sev.* 39, cf. Minniti Colonna 1973, 23. See also *Sev. Sel. Let.*, ep.x.11 (516–19/460–2), quoted at the start of this section. Steppa 2005, xvii–xviii, following Schwartz, notes that opposition to Chalcedon was particularly strong among the monks, cf. *ibid.*, xxxiii–xxxvi, on the movement's literary output, consisting mainly of hagiography.

19 *V. Sev.* 92–5. Watts 2005a, 445, puts his departure for Constantinople in 492, cf. Blaudeau 548 n.287 (placing the end of his legal studies in July 492). Rist 1998, 304, suggests that Zachariah's departure may have been caused by his father's death, cf. Minniti Colonna 1973, 19.

20 See Watts 2005a, 445, 453 and further below on the work. Treadgold 2007, 167, refers to an appointment as a governor of the Aegean islands, but this is the result of a misinterpretation of a letter of Procopius of Gaza, on which see Honigmann 1953c, 194 n.1.

As Edward Watts has convincingly argued, the dialogue represents an effort to undermine the prominent position of pagan professors in Alexandria at the time.²¹ No doubt Zachariah attracted the attention of devout anti-Chalcedonians in the capital, such as the *cubicularius* Eupraxius, to whom he dedicated his *Ecclesiastical History*, published in the 490s; he was also acquainted with another eunuch, Misael, to whom he dedicated his biographies of Peter the Iberian and Isaiah, joined now with a work on Theodore, bishop of Antinoë (in Egypt), to comprise a trilogy.²²

Much of his time must have been spent in the courts, an existence described with some disenchantment by his fellow historian Agathias, writing in the 570s.

And though I should be at leisure to improve my style by reading through the works of the great writers of antiquity, to survey with critical discernment the entire historical scene and to give my full and unfettered attention to these matters, I am instead kept busy at my desk in the Basileios Stoa from early morning to late evening busying myself with the incessant perusal of innumerable legal documents. And though I resent being overworked I am distressed if I am not, since it is impossible for me to eke out a livelihood without considerable toil and hardship.²³

At least towards the start of his career in Constantinople he enjoyed the company of his companion from student days, Zenodorus, a fellow provincial from Maiuma, who also practised law.²⁴ We know, moreover, of two other contemporaries from Gaza who also became lawyers in the capital at this time, who both rose to positions in the imperial bureaucracy – another Zachariah, indeed, and his brother Philip, both of whom were brothers of

21 See Watts 2005b, 219–24, cf. idem 2005a, 451, placing composition of the work soon after Zach.'s departure from Berytus. The dialogue echoes in many respects the *Theophrastus* of Aeneas of Gaza, composed in the 480s and also set in Alexandria, which is, however, much less overt in its Christian perspective, cf. Wegenast 1967, 2216, Watts 2005a, 215–19. See (2)(c) below.

22 PZ iii.1a for the dedication to Eupraxius, on whom see *PLRE* ii, Eupraxius. He was dead by the time of the composition of the *V. Sev.*, which refers to him as 'of pious memory', 104. *V. Isa.* 15–16/10 for the reference to Misael. Since Misael is referred to as a *cubicularius*, it follows that the trilogy must have been published before his downfall in 518, for which see *PLRE* ii, Misael, Kugener 1900a, 468–9. See Blaudeau 2006a, 548–9, on these dates. Watts 2005a, 447, argues that Zach. revised his hagiographies and brought out the new version in the 520s, a date incompatible with the reference to Misael. There seems in any case no need to suppose that these works were revised; see further n.36 below.

23 Agathias, *Hist.* iii.1.4, tr. Frendo.

24 *V. Sev.* 56, reporting his death not long before Zach. wrote his *V. Sev.*, cf. Honigmann 1953c, 199. Zenodorus is also mentioned at *V. Sev.* 90: it was he who received the letter from Aeneas of Gaza (see n.18 above).

the famous Procopius of Gaza.²⁵ Despite his career, Zachariah found time to peruse the city's bookshops, which lay close to the courts, as he recounts in more than one work.²⁶ In the works he found there he discovered further material for his polemical skills: both the *Life of Severus* and *Antirrhesis*, a rebuttal of Manichaean views, were composed in response to books that came to his attention in this way.²⁷ For three years, 508–511, he enjoyed once again the company of his friend Severus, who was in the capital to counter the disruption being caused to the anti-Chalcedonian monasteries in Palestine by the monk Nephalius. He witnessed the collaboration of Severus and Philoxenus, bishop of Mabbugh (Hierapolis), who brought down Patriarch Macedonius (496–511). Soon afterwards Severus returned to Palestine, only to be recalled to the fray as the new patriarch of Antioch in late 512.²⁸

With the accession of Justin I in 518 and the determinedly pro-Chalcedonian policies that he brought into force, the situation in Constantinople must have grown more uncomfortable for Zachariah. His friend, the *cubicularius* Misael, was even accused of plotting against the emperor and banished to Serdica.²⁹ Severus himself was forced to take refuge in Egypt, where he soon came into conflict with other anti-Chalcedonians, notably Julian of Halicarnassus. It may be in this context, indeed, that Zachariah composed his *Life of Severus* in an effort to rebut smears of paganism

25 See *PLRE* ii, Zacharias 1 and Philippus 7 with Honigmann 1953c, 201–4 (who wants, however, to conflate this Zachariah with our Zachariah, cf. n.2 above, followed by Treadgold 2007, 167).

26 The Royal Stoa (Basileios Stoa), where legal cases were heard, was situated just west of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople. It was 'essentially a big open court surrounded on all four sides by porticoes', to which was attached a public library, the university, the courts and the bookshops. See *Proc. Aed.* i.11.12–13 with Mango 1959, 48–51 (quotation from 48); also Treadgold 2007, 354–5.

27 Honigmann 1953c, 200, offers the two texts side by side to show their similarity. In both cases the passage comes in the introduction of the work and describes how a book-dealer (or a friend) drew a recent work to Zachariah's attention in the hope of persuading him to publish a rejoinder. See further (2)(vi) below. In the case of the *Antirrhesis* the introduction refers to Zach. as the bishop of Mytilene, thus furnishing an important indication of the identity of the *scholasticus* with the bishop. Honigmann points out that in this case the introduction may well evoke a fictitious encounter, of course, cf. Lieu 1994, 222.

28 Allen and Hayward 2004, 7–12. On the downfall of Macedonius see *PZ* vii.7–8 with Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009.

29 *PLRE* ii, Misael, for the sources, with Greatrex 2007a, 99–105. See also Menze 2008a, 18–30, on Justin's accession, with Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 261–2, for a different interpretation.

directed at his friend from student days.³⁰ Nor did the persecuted patriarch forget his companion: one of his letters from this period (519/520) offers a unique glimpse of our author, recalling their shared past. In this letter, addressed to a presbyter and archimandrite, Elisha, he asks him to read through a recent work of his, a refutation of a treatise of John the Grammarian. Others, he hopes, will also peruse it, as he states:

To me also it was gratifying that the wise and Christ-loving Zachariah the *scholasticus* should read the dissertation mentioned: for in the royal city (Constantinople) I used to bring my works to him, when he would listen attentively... and did not shrink from being an admirable adviser, on account of the great experience and instruction in the sacred books which he had enjoyed from his boyhood.³¹

Despite the tribulations of the anti-Chalcedonian movement, Zachariah's career, if the introduction to the *Antirrhesis* is correct, did not suffer. In 527, the date of the work's publication, he is described as being the 'advocate of the supreme court of the prefects' and 'assistant of the *comes patrimonii*'.³² Between 527 and 536, when we find him taking part in the council of Constantinople, we hear nothing of him. At this council, which condemned Severus and his followers definitively, he is attested at most sessions as bishop of Mytilene on the island of Lesbos; at the session of 21 May, however, he did not sign the document that condemned the patriarch of Constantinople, Anthimus, who had aligned himself with Severus. He appears furthermore not to have been present at the session of 4 June at which anathema was pronounced on Severus, Peter of Apamea, the monk Ze'ura and Anthimus. He did play some part in the proceedings, however, for he was chosen as one of three bishops sent to find Anthimus during the council in order to summon him to attend the proceedings; as they reported

30 These events are detailed in PZ viii–ix below; see also (e.g.) Allen and Heyward 2004, 24–8. Watts 2005a, 461–3, for the plausible suggestion that the *V. Sev.* was designed to refute the criticisms of Julian's supporters.

31 Quoted by Honigsmann 1953c, 203, from *PO* 12 (1919), 275. The reference to Zachariah's useful advice, as Honigsmann notes, corresponds with the little that John Rufus (*Pleroph.* 73 [p.128]) says of him, noting his thorough knowledge of doctrinal matters and ability to offer useful advice to others, perhaps an allusion to this case.

32 See Kugener 1900b, 208–9, Krüger 1908, 595, Wegenast 1967, 2213. The precise sense of the former title is obscure, but the second relates to the *comes patrimonii*, an office set up by the Emperor Anastasius, on which see Jones 1964, 425, Haarer 2006, 198–9. Zachariah appears to have served as a legal counsellor or *paredros* in this bureau. For an evocative general picture of life in the bureau of the praetorian prefect in Constantinople in the sixth century see Kelly 2004, 11–104.

to their colleagues, they proved unable to find him.³³ It may therefore be suggested that it was around the time of the tenure of Anthimus as patriarch of Constantinople (535–6) that Zachariah was ordained and elected bishop of Mytilene, for in the early 530s it appeared as if Justinian was coming round to Severus' views; the elderly patriarch himself even came to Constantinople for talks. The abrupt change in Justinian's church policy in 536, with the arrival of Pope Agapetus in Constantinople, leading to the definitive condemnation of the anti-Chalcedonians, may thus have been a bitter blow to the ageing Zachariah. Severus, we know, died in Egypt in February 538. The date of Zachariah's death eludes us: all that is certain is that by 553 a new bishop of Mytilene was present at the Fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople.³⁴

(2) Works

Most of Zachariah's works have been mentioned above, but it is worthwhile offering an inventory here, together with a analysis. We shall proceed in chronological order, although, as has been mentioned above, Zachariah revised some of them later in his life.³⁵

33 See Blaudeau 2006a, 545–6, Kaldellis 2002, 165–7. *ACO* iii, p.159, on his mission to find Anthimus, Menze 2008a, 196–208, on Anthimus' fall. One of the other two bishops sent was a certain Bosporius, metropolitan bishop of Neocaesarea in Pontus Polemoniaca. In *V. Isa.* 13/9 Zach. mentions a Bosporius, who served as a *scriniarius* in the office of the praetorian prefect, but who went on to become bishop of Sinope (Helenopontus), cf. *PLRE* ii, Bosporius. Given the rarity of the name, one wonders whether the two might not be identical: like Anthimus, Bosporius could have been translated from Sinope to a higher post, as metropolitan of Pontus Polemoniaca. The career pattern of the two men, from anti-Chalcedonian lawyers in Constantinople to bishops, would thus be remarkably similar. From half a century earlier, one might cite the parallel of Eusebius of Dorylaeum, described by Evagrius (i.9) as a *scholasticus* and said by Theophanes, 88, to have practised in the basilica at Constantinople. Having vigorously opposed Nestorius in the run-up to the Council of Ephesus (431), he subsequently became bishop of Dorylaeum (before 448). See *PLRE* ii, Eusebius 15 (referring to him as an *agens in rebus* and advocate), Whitby 2000, 26 n.82.

34 We follow Blaudeau 2006a, 546 and nn.268–9, in our interpretation of Zachariah's career; others have supposed that his ordination occurred somewhat earlier, e.g. in the reign of Justin. On Justinian's ecclesiastical policies in the 530s see PZ ix with Stein 1949, 376–85, Evans 1996, 110–11, 183–4, Allen and Hayward 2004, 28–9, van Rompay 2005, 244–7; Allen and Hayward 2004, 30, for the date of Severus' death.

35 Minniti Colonna 1973, 27, adds a funerary oration for Menas (referred to at *V. Sev.* 45) to these works, but nothing of it has survived, if indeed it was ever published. For a similar list of works and editions of Zach. see Kaldellis 2002, 218–20.

(i) The *Life of Isaiah* (V. Isa., CPG 7000, BHO 550) and a *Life of Peter the Iberian* (CPG 7001)

Of the latter only a couple of lines survive in Syriac, if indeed they are genuine. Both were composed, as Zachariah tells us in the *V. Sev.*, in the early 490s; some have argued for a subsequent revision, probably in the 510s, when they were incorporated into a trilogy of works, together with a (lost) *Life of Theodore of Antinoë*, dedicated to the *cubicularius* Misael.³⁶ Although René Draguet expressed some doubts as to the attribution of the *Life of Isaiah* to Zachariah, his arguments have found little favour more recently.³⁷ The work, only some twelve pages in length, offers a brief biography of the holy man, who, like Peter the Iberian, was based in Palestine and died in 491. It contains a series of anecdotes about Isaiah, some deriving from his own experiences, others from oral sources. Of some interest is a reference to the philosopher Aeneas of Gaza, who, Zachariah claims, used to consult Isaiah about obscure passages of Plato, should other sources of help prove inadequate.³⁸ The brief fragment of the *Life of Peter the Iberian* was edited and translated by Brooks in the same volume as the *Life of Isaiah*. The authenticity of this exiguous extract is far from certain, however, and it is not even clear whether it concerns Peter at all.³⁹ A Georgian *Life of Peter the Iberian*, translated from the Syriac, was thought once to derive, albeit

36 V. Sev. 83 for the allusion to the composition of the *Lives* of Isaiah and Peter, cf. Kugener 1900a, 467–9, Watts 2005a, 447–8, 459–60. Rist 1998, 305, dates the two works to 495/500, cf. Minniti Colonna 1973, 28–9, which is incompatible with the reference in the *V. Sev.*, unless we suppose a significant gap between composition and publication (the solution of Kugener, *loc. cit.*). See n.22 above for doubts on the notion of a later revision. Rist 2005, 351 n.76, rightly rejects the theory propounded by Kugener 1900a of two Zachariahs, one the author of these *Lives*, the other the church historian.

37 Draguet 1968, 98*–115*, but cf. Chitty 1971, 50–65, Devos 1975, 159 n.2, Allen 1980, 471 n.5, Rist 2005, 346–7, Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006, 20 and n.75.

38 V. Isa. 12/8 for the anecdote, cf. Steppa 2005, 19, Watts 2010, 138–40. Kugener 1900a considers the work in detail, cf. Watts 2010, 129–30. See also Chitty 1971, 63, Blaudeau 2006a, 577–8, on Zach.'s sources. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 73 (p.128) recounts how Zach. beheld a vision of Isaiah while studying at Berytus: he dreamed that he was in church with Chalcedonians, who were treating the chalice containing Christ's blood scornfully, and that Isaiah enjoined him to flee contact with the heretics. Evidently Zach. was well acquainted with Isaiah and had no difficulty recognising him in his vision, cf. V. Sev. 78, where he tells us that he was in communion with Peter the Iberian, John bishop of Sebennytyos, Theodore of Antinoë and Isaiah.

39 Horn 2006, 46, offers a translation of the fragment (Brooks 1907, 18/12, for the text and Latin tr.), 'yet already also in vain praises, from which shameful passions tend to arise. And they took this bond of temporary silence in order to be cleansed by it and to learn, as Gregory [Nazianzen] says, "the measure of speech and silence"'. *Ibid.*, 44–6, against the authenticity of the fragment. See also Rist 2005, 347–8.

with alterations, from Zachariah, but this too has been thrown into doubt recently.⁴⁰

(ii) *A Vita Paralii*

At least two modern scholars have independently posited the existence of a further biography by Zachariah, that of a student at Alexandria, Paralius. Although from a pagan family, he grew increasingly disillusioned with the pagan doctrines he came across and, with help from Zachariah, is described as having exposed a trick that was claimed as a miracle by the pagans. This culminated in his baptism and in a campaign against a pagan shrine at Menuthis, mentioned above. Some thirty pages of the *Life of Severus* are given over to the Paralius episode, leading to the hypothesis that, since Severus plays no role whatsoever in the events, Zachariah has simply inserted material he had prepared earlier into his new biography.⁴¹ Although the episode has frequently been mined by scholars as a source for the survival of paganism in Egypt, the reliability of Zachariah's account has recently been called into question. Commonplaces and inconsistencies abound in his version, not to mention odd omissions: he fails to mention, for instance, an important church at Menuthis established already in the early fifth century.⁴²

(iii) *Ammonius* or *De mundi opificio (disputatio)* (CPG 6996)

This dialogue, which features a student – in fact, Zachariah himself – overcoming both the philosopher Ammonius and the iatrosophist (professor of medicine) Gessius in a series of exchanges in front of a student audience, has as its chief theme the eternity of the world. It was written probably in the early 490s, as Zachariah approached the end of his student career at Berytus. As mentioned above, it draws heavily on the *Theophrastus* of Aeneas of Gaza, a work which appeared only a few years earlier.⁴³ But whereas Aeneas' dialogue features fictional interlocutors and contains very

40 Horn 2006, 47–9, but cf. Rist 2005, 350–1. The overlap between *V. Isa.*, *HE* and the Georgian *Life of Peter* as regards the journey of Cosmas to persuade Peter and Isaiah to visit Zeno is striking: see PZ vi.3 with notes *ad loc.*

41 Bauer 1967 first drew attention to this issue, 212–14, 227, a contribution unfortunately overlooked by Watts 2005a, 441–4, 461, who arrives at more or less the same conclusion, cf. idem 2010, 1–22, 142–52.

42 See Cameron 2007, 23–8, Gascou 2007, 265, 276–80 with the response of Watts 2010, 265–8.

43 Minniti Colonna 1973 offers an edition and Italian translation of the work. She discusses the setting of the dialogue at 38, placing it in 486 or 487. She offers a summary of the work at 38–44; *ibid.* 45–54 on the influences on the dialogue, especially Plato, cf. also Kaldellis 2002, 164–5. On Aeneas' *Theophrastus* see Colonna 1958, vii–xvii, di Berardino 2006, 259–65.

few references to Christianity, relying almost entirely on traditional philosophical reasoning to back up its arguments, Zachariah's consciously introduces actual living philosophers and deploys biblical passages to justify his points. Edward Watts convincingly explains the difference between the two works as a product of their diverging aims. On the one hand, Aeneas' was a more traditional dialogue, a work that he might circulate among colleagues, including some at Alexandria. On the other, Zachariah's work, which pulled no punches in its criticism of the two pagan philosophers, was seeking 'to redefine the intellectual power dynamic within the Alexandrian schools', to turn the tables on the pagans who remained powerful.⁴⁴ It is likely that he remained in contact with the Philoponoi in Alexandria and hoped, by this dialogue, to undermine the authority that attended the leading pagan philosophers of the city.⁴⁵ Some have supposed that the work was later revised and that the dialogue with Gessius was inserted at this stage, since it is not mentioned in the introduction or conclusion. Although a revision cannot be ruled out, the grounds proposed are somewhat shaky.⁴⁶

(iv) *The Ecclesiastical History* (CPG 6995)

See section (3) below.

(v) *The Life of Severus* (CPG 6996, BHO 1060)

Zachariah's hundred-page biography of the anti-Chalcedonian leader Severus

⁴⁴ Watts 2005b is a recent consideration of the relationship between Aeneas' and Zach.'s works, whose interpretation is adopted here; the quotation comes from Watts 2005a, 451, cf. 450–3 generally. Watts 2005a, 451 n.54, dates the work to 490/1, at any rate in its initial version, cf. idem 2005b, 224. Merlan 1968, 194–7, argues that the dialogue reflects actual discussions between Zachariah and the two philosophers.

Ammonius himself was a controversial character, even among pagans. Damascius (118B, p.281) is highly critical of him, cf. Athanassiadi 1999, 30–2. Having arrived in Alexandria only in 485, he was able by means of some sort of compromise to continue teaching in Alexandria even after other pagan philosophers had been persecuted and expelled, which perhaps made him all the more of a threat in Zachariah's view. See also Sorabji 2005 and Watts 2010, 75–85 on Ammonius' compromise.

⁴⁵ So Watts 2005b, 224–5, cf. idem 2005a, 453.

⁴⁶ Watts 2005a, 453, idem 2005b, 220, 225, favours a revision in the 520s, but his supposition that Gessius was a 'contemporary pagan thinker' at that time is quite mistaken: Damascius specifically dates his heyday to the reign of Zeno (128, pp.290–3 with 291 n.342), cf. *PLRE* ii, Gessius 3, although his career may have stretched into the 530s; see Watts 2009b, 121–2, 131. Minniti Colonna 1973, 44–5, dates the work to the end of Zachariah's career, when he was a Chalcedonian, which thus accounts for its survival in Greek; she also considers the Gessius section to be an addition. She suggests, moreover, *ibid.*, 23 n.62, that Zachariah's brother Stephanus (see n.18 above) may have been a contemporary of Gessius in his student days, cf. 37.

was written at some point after Severus ascended the patriarchal throne at Antioch in November 512. It concentrates on Severus' career up to this point and does not deal with subsequent events. He undertook the work, he explains right at the start, in order to refute scurrilous allegations that the patriarch had been a pagan and even taken part in sacrifices while studying at Berytus.⁴⁷ The most likely context for the composition of such a work is at some point after the accession of Justin I, as noted above, when the leaders of the anti-Chalcedonian community, having sought refuge in Egypt, split into fiercely opposed factions. The partisans of Julian of Halicarnassus had every interest in besmirching the reputation of their great rival, Severus, and may well have circulated documents alleging the pagan past of the patriarch of Antioch.⁴⁸ As Walter Bauer persuasively argued, Severus' opponents were almost certainly quite justified in making these allegations: Zachariah's efforts to show otherwise are singularly ineffectual. Without rehearsing Bauer's arguments in detail, we may conclude that it was only at Berytus that the future patriarch finally became a Christian. As Zachariah himself concedes, it was at this point that he received baptism. Moreover, as has emerged since Bauer's day, Severus admits as much in a sermon dedicated to St Leontius (of Tripolis), insisting on his own conversion during his studies at Berytus; the relevant section, it is worth noting, was preserved in Coptic but omitted from the Syriac translation of the original Greek. Concerning Severus' career at Alexandria Zachariah has very little to say, preferring to concentrate on the Paralios episode, noted above. Even at Berytus, Severus plays no part in the campaign waged by Zachariah's Christian allies against the pagans, merely, according to our author, offering useful advice from the sidelines. Only from about two-thirds of the way through the biography does Severus come to the foreground, following his baptism.⁴⁹

47 *V. Sev.* 7–9, cf. 46, 75 with Rist 2005, 339. See n.27 above on how Zach. encountered the work in which the accusation was made in Constantinople. For a survey of editions and translations of the *V. Sev.* see Rist 2005, 337–8, to which must be added the English tr. of Ambjörn.

48 See n.30 above for references. Others, however, place the work soon after Severus' consecration, so (e.g.) Rist 1998, 305.

49 Bauer 1967 for his arguments, cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 5, Watts 2005a, 441. As Bauer points out, 215–16, Zachariah's trepidation when he first saw Severus in Berytus (*V. Sev.* 47), and then the advice he gives him (to avoid entertainments and the like, *ibid.*, 50–1), both strongly imply that his fellow-student remained a pagan, far from being a catechumen when he arrived in Alexandria (*V. Sev.* 11). The *V. Sev.* starts focussing on Severus from p.76 onwards. Garitte 1966, 338–41, 353, compares the two versions of Severus' sermon; the section concerned (of *Homily* 27) is iv.2–6, translated at 374, and it is worth noting that it refers to a *scholasticus* friend (i.e. Zachariah) who accompanied him to the church when he went there to

The *Life of Severus* thus appears to be a somewhat sloppily constructed work, incorporating material that Zachariah may well have written up, if not published, at an earlier point. Not only is the *Vita Paralii* likely to be an insertion from an earlier work, but the account of the struggle against pagans in Berytus may also represent a separate composition.⁵⁰ For all this, it is a remarkably informative and interesting source. We have already exploited it for much detail about Zachariah's own life: the author is constantly present in the text. We have also noted how important it is as a description of student life in both Alexandria and Berytus in this period. It remains to underline how it combines Zachariah's diverse interests very neatly. On the one hand, his concern to take on the pagans, to prove the superiority of Christianity, emerges very clearly, especially in the two sections on Paralius and Berytus. In both cases, and above all the former, much emphasis is placed on the vanity of pagan beliefs, and their falsity is vividly brought to light. Conversions follow and some pagans at least admit their errors. Likewise, in the *Ammonius*, the pagan philosophers are defeated by the superior arguments of their Christian adversary. Similarities to the *Ecclesiastical History* may also be observed. There are no miracles in the *Life of Severus*: the work rather celebrates his asceticism and willingness to struggle on behalf of the anti-Chalcedonian cause. The monastic existence, described in the case of the holy man Evagrius, Severus' godfather, as *praktikê philosophia*, is clearly what Zachariah admires; it is a way of life that the holy man Isaiah also practised, as a consequence of which he was able to advise Aeneas on Platonic problems. In the *Ecclesiastical History* we also find *praktikoi*, practitioners of the ascetic life.⁵¹ Similarly, miracles in the *Ecclesiastical History* are rare and alluded to only briefly, as in the case of the Samaritan who was cured by the blood of anti-Chalcedonian martyrs (iii.6). Finally, it is worth noting a certain interest in doctrinal disputes, as opposed to the anti-pagan struggle. This aspect comes to the fore only towards the very end

pray. For an English tr. of the section see Trombley 1994, 49–50. Rist 2005, 340, suggests that the Paralius section is aimed at offering a parallel for Severus: like Severus, Paralius took part in anti-pagan activities even before his baptism. The accusation of paganism surfaced again in 536 in the context of accusations of causing a massacre of (Chalcedonian) monks in 516: see ACO iii, pp.39–40 with Millar 2008, 78 (for a translation), Greatrex 2007b, 286–7.

50 On the former, see (b) above. On the latter (*V. Sev.* 57–75), Bauer 1967, 216, Watts 2005a, 440 (who does not go so far as to suggest a separate work, however).

51 On Isaiah and Aeneas see p.13 above, cf. Watts 2005a, 450–1 on this point. On Evagrius see *V. Sev.* 55. On the issue of miracles, Watts 2005a, 454–8, cf. Merlan 1968, 195, stressing Zach.'s preference for promoting Christianity by rational arguments. PZ iv.1a refers to Timothy Aelurus as a *praktikos*, cf. v.9a, where the term is applied to the holy man Isaiah.

of the work, notably in his remarkably hostile portrayal of the disputatious monk Nephalius, who in 487 stirred up trouble for Peter Mongus in Egypt, and then in 508 had Severus expelled from his monastery in Palestine.⁵²

(vi) *Capita vii contra Manichaeos* ('Seven Chapters against the Manichaeans', CPG 6997)

The date of the composition of this brief work is uncertain, but it certainly preceded the *Antirrhesis* (vii), since it is referred to in the prologue of that work. Both these works were directed against the Manichaeans, a dualist religious sect that had enjoyed some success in the Roman empire, despite repression since the start of the fourth century. The Seven Chapters take the form of anathemas on aspects of Manichaean belief, i.e. they offer a series of statements beginning 'I anathematise', condemning various beliefs of the Manichaeans. Zachariah appears to have derived his information on Manichaean belief from a range of sources, none of them identified. According to the leading scholar of Manichaeism, Sam Lieu, one can infer 'from the excellent information which the *Seven Chapters* provide on Manichaean cosmogony and cultic practices that he was truthful in his claim [in the prologue] to have access to genuine Manichaean works.' The work thus represents Zachariah's continuing interest in refuting non-Christian groups, albeit in this case not strictly a pagan one. Since the Manichaeans, moreover, acknowledged Christ, their views on his nature were of some relevance to the christological disputes that raged in the fifth and sixth centuries. Some polemicists associated them with the opponents of Chalcedon on the grounds that they doubted his physical existence on earth, a view comparable to some followers of Eutyches. Zachariah's wholesale rejection of the sect may thus represent not only an attack on a non-Christian group, but also an effort to disassociate the anti-Chalcedonians from the Manichaeans.⁵³

52 *V. Sev.* 100–1, cf. *PZ* vi.2, with similar details. See (e.g.) Allen and Hayward 2004, 8, on Nephalius. Note also Zach.'s reference (*V. Sev.* 105) to Severus' refutation of accusations of Eutychianism, a heresy likewise associated with Timothy Aelurus, as noted at *PZ* iv.12a, v.4a, and successfully rebutted by that patriarch.

53 The work is edited with an English translation by Lieu 1994, 234–54, with a commentary following. The quotation comes from *ibid.*, 223. See 219–25 on the work generally, 224 on the association of Manichaeans and Eutychians (termed Monophysites), cf. Blaudeau 2006b, 174–5. The seriousness with which the abjuration of Manichaeism was taken is indicated by *C.J.* i.5.16.4–5, decreeing the death penalty for those who merely simulated a conversion from it to Christianity, cf. Lieu 1994, 212.

(vii) The *Antirrhesis* ('*Refutation*'), also known as *Adversus Manichaeos* (CPG 6998)

The prologue of this work describes how a bookseller in Constantinople, having come across a Manichaean pamphlet at the time that Justinian was legislating against the sect, asked Zachariah, then a *scholasticus* but subsequently bishop of Mytilene, to compose a refutation of it on the grounds that he had already produced the Seven Chapters (noted above).⁵⁴ There follows a short disquisition attacking, in strictly philosophical terms, the equal status given by the Manichaeans to good and evil, and insisting rather on the primacy of God. Once again it is possible to observe Zachariah's penchant for philosophical arguments as well as his keenness to refute the errors of non-Christians.⁵⁵

(3) His *Ecclesiastical History* (HE)

(i) Introduction

Any discussion of Zachariah of Mytilene's *Ecclesiastical History* is of necessity hypothetical. We do not know how long the work was nor what exactly it contained. PZ, as we shall see, incorporated a Syriac translation of the work into his *Miscellaneous History*. This Syriac translation may well have been an abridgement rather than a straightforward translation. PZ in turn may have made further excisions.⁵⁶ But PZ is not the only witness to Zachariah's work. On the one hand, there is the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian, which, as we shall discuss in C below, sometimes contains elements omitted by PZ: it is therefore possible, as we shall suggest, that he had access to a fuller version of Zachariah's *HE*. More importantly, however, the sixth-century church historian Evagrius of Epiphania made extensive use of Zachariah's work, albeit usually in order to signal his disagreement

54 The text of this prologue (from the Moscow manuscript) is given with a translation by Lieu 1994, 220–1, cf. Kugener 1900b, 208, Honigsmann 1953c, 198–200. At 198 Honigsmann dates the work to 'perhaps between April 1 and August 1 527', i.e. the joint reign of Justin I and Justinian. The latter continued to legislate vigorously against the Manichaeans, however, at least until 531: see Stein 1949, 370–1, Lieu 1992, 210–15, with *C.J.* i.5.12.3, i.5.21 and *Mal.* 17.21, although Lim 1995, 104–7 and Walker 206, 173 note debates with Manichaeans under Justinian. By the end of the sixth century the sect had been eliminated.

55 The work is edited by Demetrakopoulos, 1–4, also by Pitra, 67–70. Minniti Colonna 1973, 32, suggests that it is merely a fragment from a larger work of which the remainder is lost. It is followed by 49 brief paragraphs, posing questions that a Manichaean needs to answer (Demetrakopoulos, 4–14), followed by a further 16 (14–18).

56 See section C (3)(i) below. Cf. Whitby 2003, 460, stressing this same point.

with it.⁵⁷ Finally, we must also bear in mind that not all of what we find in PZ iii–vi stems from Zachariah: at least a few elements, such as the lists of patriarchs, have clearly been added by the later compiler.⁵⁸

(ii) Composition and nature of the work

Whereas the nature of PZ's work is still the subject of debate, there is no doubt that Zachariah wrote an *Ecclesiastical History*, a genre established by Eusebius of Caesarea at the start of the fourth century.⁵⁹ Whereas for Eusebius it was possible for most of his work, covering the period of the apostles to his own day, to deal with the church as distinct from the Roman empire, the task became more challenging in the wake of Constantine's conversion and the establishment of an increasingly Christian empire: the boundaries of the genre became more blurred as secular and ecclesiastical affairs grew ever more closely intertwined. Perhaps for this reason few came forward to take up the mantle until the mid-fifth century, when under Theodosius II (408–450) three church historians composed works that covered the period since Constantine's conversion. Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret – to be discussed more fully below in dealing with PZ's sources – treated church affairs from Constantine to Theodosius II, but generally chose to conclude their accounts somewhat before the time at which they were writing. Their decision is likely to have been motivated at least in part by the controversies that were still raging at the time, whose outcome remained uncertain; in such circumstances it was prudent to leave such matters to an eventual successor. Zachariah, whose work dates from the opening years of Anastasius' reign, i.e. (probably) between 492 and 495, was thus part of an ongoing tradition, and like his predecessors earlier in the century, he took up his account where they break off – or, more accurately, within a few years of the end-point of their work. For, as we shall see later in section C (3)(iv), Socrates' account covers events up to 438, while Zachariah's opens with the Council of Chalcedon in 451.⁶⁰ The precise date of publication cannot be determined,

57 Allen 1980 offers a detailed assessment of Evagrius' use of Zach.; below C (4) on Mich. Syr. It has been suggested that Liberatus made use of Zach.'s work in compiling his *Breviarium* in the mid-sixth century, since he refers to a Greek ecclesiastical history that he had found in Alexandria (1/98–9); modern scholars, however, unanimously reject this theory, cf. Whitby 2003, 473 n.50, Blaudeau 2006a, 541 (less categorical). There is moreover no obvious trace of Zach. in Liberatus' work, although they deal with the same events. See also PZ vi n.6.

58 See section C (3)(iii).

59 As we note below (section C, n.7), some manuscripts of PZ have as a heading 'ecclesiastical history', cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 520.

60 So Whitby 2003, 461, suggesting plausibly that Zach. chose to start then in order not

but there is a general consensus that it appeared in the early 490s, soon after Zachariah's move to Constantinople. The work, as we are told at iii.1a, was dedicated to a certain Eupraxius, a *cubicularius* (chamberlain) otherwise known only from the correspondence of Severus and Zachariah's biography of the patriarch; he supported Severus during his stay in Constantinople (508–11) but had died by the time Zachariah came to write the *V. Sev.*⁶¹

The genre of ecclesiastical (or church) history was still evolving at the time Zachariah was writing. For Eusebius and his first generation of successors there was a fair amount of consensus, although differences between Theodoret on the one hand and Socrates and Sozomen on the other are perceptible. The former sought to exclude secular matters, keeping to the Eusebian precedent, while the other two dealt in considerable detail with political events, although they felt the need to justify this element. Nevertheless, all three Theodosian writers kept to the parameters laid out by Eusebius in *HE* i.1, dealing with the succession of orthodox bishops and leading church figures, as well as persecutors and heretics, persecutions and martyrdoms.⁶² But with the deep divisions engendered by Chalcedon the genre took a new turn. The constituent elements remain for the most part the same, such as the frequent citation of documents, the occasional insertion of miraculous elements, the listing of patriarchs, but all of these were now subordinated to factional interests. The (eastern) empire witnessed fierce struggles between rival ecclesiastical parties, which frequently each had their own nominee for a particular patriarchate, as well as their own traditions on individuals and councils. Hence church historians reflect these traditions, quoting documents that support their perspective and interpreting events in such a way as to vindicate their doctrinal position.⁶³

to have to deal with the vindication of Eutyches at Ephesus II in 449 which then turned into a source of embarrassment for the anti-Chalcedonians, cf. Treadgold 2007, 167.

61 See *PLRE* ii, Eupraxius for the details, *V. Sev.* 104, 106. Minniti Colonna 1973, 28, puts publication in 492/5, cf. Kaldellis 2002, 161, Whitby 2003, 459, di Berardino 2006, 267 (c.492), Blaudeau 2006a, 554–5, 558–9. Treadgold 2007, 167, places it 'not before 495', but partly because he follows Kugener in placing the author's birth as late as 470.

62 See Liebeschuetz 1993 and Markus 1975 generally on the genre, cf. Blaudeau 2001b, 78–9, idem 2006a, 494–509. There has been much recent work on Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret: see e.g. Leppin 2003, Urbainczyk 1997, eadem 2002, van Nuffelen 2004b and the recent *Sources Chrétiennes* editions of all three.

63 See Blaudeau 2006a, 511–13, on this development. He terms the post-Theodosian writers (such as Zachariah and Theodore Lector) the 'third generation' of church historians. Of course, the Theodosian writers were also interested in promoting an anti-Arian line, just as their rival historian, Philostorgius, took the opposite approach (on whom see Treadgold 2007, 126–34).

In Zachariah's day the Council of Chalcedon remained the issue that divided the eastern empire. In his work we may detect certain tendencies that relate to this issue and to the factions that sought to determine imperial policy in regard to the council. First, his hostility towards the council, clearly expressed already in his selective reporting of its proceedings at iii.1, which is presented as a triumph for Theodoret and the Nestorians; he even alludes to Marcian's summoning of Nestorius to the council.⁶⁴ Second, his firm support for and concentration on the Alexandrian patriarchs, and in particular Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus: Philippe Blaudeau, in an exhaustive analysis of Zachariah's work, has argued that the writer is indeed propounding a template for how the empire should be administered, at least in regard to doctrinal matters. According to this scheme, it is Alexandria that should have the prime role, ably supported by the Palestinian church – also covered in some detail by Zachariah – while the ambitions of Constantinople and its patriarch must be resisted, and Antioch has but a minor part. Rome does feature in his work, but is clearly of only tangential importance.⁶⁵ This new 'geo-ecclesiology', as Blaudeau terms it, is thus based on the primacy of Alexandria, whose (anti-Chalcedonian) patriarchs are portrayed as stout defenders of orthodoxy, willing to compromise with their opponents when necessary, respected by the monks and holy men, and occasionally backed explicitly by miraculous forces.⁶⁶ Third, his anti-Chalcedonianism is far from extreme: he is at pains to praise Peter Mongus and highlight his achievements, e.g. in his presentation of the *Henoticon* (v.7e). At the same time, on numerous occasions he distances Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus from the Eutychian heresy and is clearly critical of the extremists who pushed Peter to go beyond the *Henoticon* and condemn Chalcedon explicitly.⁶⁷ His particular distaste for Nephalius (vi.2, cf. *V. Sev.* 100–1) may reflect personal animosity, since this 'agitator' was active at the time Zachariah had studied in Egypt.⁶⁸

64 See Blaudeau 2006a, 584–5, on this chapter, noting also three anti-Chalcedonian elements in PZ also to be found, almost word for word, in PD (cf. PZV i, iii–iv), which may represent an insertion by PZ rather than Zach. See further n.86 below.

65 See Blaudeau 2006a, ch.7.

66 Blaudeau 2006a, 601–9; cf. also Wickham 2007, a useful review of this work.

67 Cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 606–7, arguing that Zach. deliberately conceals Peter's long association with Timothy before succeeding him in order not to encourage unfavourable comparisons with his predecessor. Note e.g. v.9a–b for Zach.'s hostility towards the hard-liners, where he also stresses the backing of Peter the Iberian and Isaiah of Gaza for Peter Mongus. See (e.g.) iii.9 and v.4 for his explicit rejection of the Eutychian heresy, which he equates with Nestorianism (vi.12gg)

68 See vi.2a and n.23, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 577.

At iii.1a Zachariah briefly explains his aim in composing his work: it is to provide Eupraxius with an account of the history of the church from 449 onwards, with particular reference to the patriarchs of the major sees, and to explain how the two heresies – Nestorianism (i.e. Chalcedonianism) and Eutychianism (i.e. strict Monophysitism) – divided the church and empire. By means of his work he could express his condemnation of the heresies and insist on the importance of adhering to the doctrines of the first three ecumenical councils.⁶⁹ As he indicates, he incorporates into the narrative the names of the patriarchs of the period, as well as those of several leading Christians, for the most part, as one might expect, on the anti-Chalcedonian side, such as Peter the Iberian and the holy man Isaiah; as we shall discuss in C (3)(iii) below, the lists of patriarchs, on the other hand, were inserted by PZ on the basis of a separate source.⁷⁰ His focus, as we have seen, is on the patriarchs of Alexandria, as on the emperor himself, although secular events are barely reported. It is quite likely, as Philippe Blaudeau has suggested, that Zachariah's original work was divided into three parts, not four, built upon the reigns of the emperors. The first part thus dealt with Marcian's reign, the second with Leo's, and the third with Basiliscus' usurpation and Zeno's reign.⁷¹ Zachariah evidently believed that it was legitimate for the emperor to intervene in doctrinal affairs, reporting favourably Basiliscus' and Zeno's initiatives; and although he disapproved for the most part of the interventions of Marcian and Leo, he is careful not to criticise them overtly, noting the former's sadness at the suffering of the Egyptians at the hands of Proterius (iii.11b) and blaming Leo's advisers, such as the patriarch Anatolius (iv.8), for his failure to take action against Chalcedon.⁷²

(iii) Sources

Like his predecessors, Zachariah incorporated a large number of documents into his work; Blaudeau detects twenty, taking into account certain ones

69 It is worth noting (cf. section C below, n.65) that Zach.'s preface is likely to have been more substantial than the brief paragraph PZ includes; hence Witakowski has argued that the preface at PZ i.1 (translated in F below) may also emanate from Zach., where a concern to edify the reader is underlined. Van Ginkel 1995, 63–4, argues that Mich. Syr. viii.10 (185a/37) has a somewhat fuller version of the preface than what survives in MS A (although they are very close), cf. Weltecke 2003, 138 n.46, pointing out subtle variants in the description of Zach. here.

70 Below C (3)(iii), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 525.

71 Blaudeau 2006a, 563–4, noting that such a division would break the work down into three more or less equal parts: the Theodosian church historians had likewise built their works around imperial reigns. Treadgold 2007, 167, assumes that the work was originally in four books.

72 See Blaudeau 2006a, 614–17.

that survive only in Michael the Syrian or are alluded to by Evagrius.⁷³ This point is worth stressing, since some earlier scholars arrived at a very different assessment of the work, describing it as ‘not really history’, but rather ‘memoirs entrusted to a friend by a partisan, albeit a moderate one’.⁷⁴ Such a view has little to recommend it, given the wealth of documentation provided. Zachariah almost certainly had access to collections of documents from Alexandria, an example of which survives as *Codex Vaticanus Gr.* 1431 (Schwartz 1927b), an Egyptian compilation of the 480s which also promotes the moderate line favoured by Peter Mongus; the last three documents in the collection (before an appendix) are Basiliscus’ *Encyclicon*, his *Antienyclicon*, and Zeno’s *Henoticon*, two of which are reproduced by Zachariah.⁷⁵

Zachariah thus had at his disposal collections of documents and correspondence, which allowed him to quote *in extenso* letters from or to the patriarchs of Alexandria in particular.⁷⁶ The *Ecclesiastical History* of Timothy Aelurus, composed in the 470s, will no doubt also have provided ample material for the historian, who did not hesitate to include extensive citations from the patriarch’s correspondence.⁷⁷ Since he wrote up his work in Constantinople, however, he is likely also to have had access to some dossiers of imperial correspondence, e.g. at iv.5b–c (exchanges between

⁷³ Blaudeau 2006a, 522 n.147.

⁷⁴ Petit 1900, 528, cf. Réville 1900, 413, Wegenast 1967, 2215; *contra*, Whitby 2003, 463, 465, Blaudeau 2006a, 522.

⁷⁵ See Blaudeau 2006a, 567–70, on Zach.’s use of a collection of this type; *ibid.*, 372–5, on the nature of the collection, which otherwise incorporates numerous letters of church fathers that bolster the anti-Chalcedonian position. At the very end of the work (cf. Schwartz 1927b, 9) the scribe added the Tome of Leo, the definition of faith of Chalcedon, and Leo’s second Tome, as a demonstration of the ‘bad faith’ of the Chalcedonians, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 372. Zach.’s omission of the *Antienyclicon* was certainly deliberate, for which Evagr. iii.7 reproaches him, offering the full text.

⁷⁶ See Blaudeau 2006a, 370–80, on three collections of documents put together during Peter Mongus’ patriarchate destined to promote his moderate anti-Chalcedonian stance and to emphasise the consistency of the Alexandrian doctrinal position. The second is *Cod. Vatic. Gr.* 1431 (noted above), the third the falsified correspondence between Acacius and Peter (see PZ v n.121), while the first is postulated by Blaudeau on the basis of Zach.’s work and comprises various statements of Peter quoted by Zach.: see Blaudeau, *op. cit.*, 371.

⁷⁷ Timothy’s *Ecclesiastical History* does not survive but may have influenced Coptic works. See Blaudeau 2006a, 367–8 and n.502, cf. Watts 2009a, 92–3; Blaudeau believes that Zach. may have drawn extensively on the work, *ibid.* 369 and n.508, cf. 569. One of the longest chapters in PZ’s work is iv.12, where one of Timothy’s letters is quoted, complete with patristic citations to back up his points.

Pope Leo and the Emperor Leo, cf. v.9b, exchanges between Pope Simplicius and Zeno).⁷⁸

Given that Zachariah had lived through the events at least of the latter part of the period he treated, it is not surprising to find evidence of oral sources in his work. Indeed, in his biography of Severus, he actually mentions his gathering of information for his biographies of Isaiah and others around 490. No doubt sources such as Isaiah, Peter the Iberian and John Rufus could have supplemented the information he had to hand from his documentary sources; it is likely, for instance, that the anecdote of the Samaritan cured of his blindness by the blood of anti-Chalcedonians (iii.6) originated in an oral tradition, rather like the many stories assembled by John Rufus in his *Plerophoriae*.⁷⁹

(iv) The relation between PZ and Zach.'s *HE*

It is important to emphasise that PZ is not the only witness to Zachariah's *Ecclesiastical History*, as we mentioned above in section (a). Table 2 (pp. 27–8 below), covering the four books of PZ that derive from Zachariah, gives some idea of what of his work survives in the two other main sources to have used his history; whether Michael the Syrian made independent use of Zach. or rather a fuller version of PZ remains uncertain. We have designated with a 'Z' the instances in Evagrius where he makes specific reference to Zachariah by name.

Pauline Allen has considered in detail Evagrius' technique of using Zachariah in order to reject his assertions. He felt that his predecessor wrote 'without objectivity' (Gk. *empathôs*) and, where possible, quoted other documents to refute his assertions. His objections to Zachariah's portrayal of events are often helpful in giving an idea of what documents must have been included in the original version of his work, before it was abridged and translated by PZ or another author. Thus at ii.8 he rejects Zachariah's description of the death of Proterius (iv.2), noting that he relied unduly heavily on a letter of Timothy Aelurus to the Emperor Leo – a letter not preserved in PZ. Similarly, at ii.10 he reports that Zachariah related in detail the reply of Amphilochius of Side to Leo's *Codex Encyclius*, whereas no trace of the letter is preserved in PZ iv.7; Michael the Syrian, on the other hand, does provide extracts from it. It seems reasonable therefore to infer

78 See Blaudeau 2006a, 522 n.147, 570. He suggests that Eupraxius may have assisted Zach. in gaining access to these dossiers.

79 See n.36 above on Zach.'s gathering of information (V. Sev. 83). Blaudeau 2006a, 577, for his use of oral sources.

that PZ (or the copyist of our manuscript of PZ) has here truncated Zachariah's original version.⁸⁰ At iii.5 Evagrius likewise preserves quotations from the synodical letter of the bishops who assembled in Ephesus in 475 in support of Basiliscus' *Encyclicon* that are not to be found in Zachariah, although in this chapter he is clearly dependent on him: we may reasonably therefore infer again that Zachariah's original complete citation has been abridged.⁸¹ As we have noted already, Evagrius was naturally critical of Zachariah's deliberate omission of the *Antiencyclicon* and made good this gap himself.⁸²

There are of course risks in restoring a full Zachariah from Evagrius, and we must be cautious before ascribing too much to him. We should probably not suppose that Evagrius' section on the return of Zeno to the throne after Basiliscus' usurpation necessarily stems from his work, even if the notices on either side of it do derive from him.⁸³ On the other hand, it may safely be supposed, since Evagrius notes (ii.9) that Zachariah specifically affirms it, that Zachariah was heavily critical of the *volte-face* of the Asiatic bishops after Zeno's return. Probably he cited their petition to the emperor to illustrate this, parts of which are quoted by Evagrius, although nothing survives in our version of PZ.⁸⁴ The next important instance in which Evagrius testifies to a fuller version of Zachariah than that which has come down to us is at iii.18, where Evagrius indicates that Zachariah had described how John Talaia persuaded pope Felix to excommunicate Acacius because of his contact with Peter Mongus; the patriarch of Constantinople, however, ignored the excommunication, which was delivered to him by the Akoimetai monks. Evagrius rejects this version, claiming that it was 'mutilated', and proceeds to demonstrate the incorrectness of his predecessor by drawing on records of Felix's council of 484. This section, had it been transmitted by PZ, would have fallen at the end of book v or at the start of vi.⁸⁵

80 See Allen 1980, 474–6, on these cases; cf. more generally Rist 2002, 94–7, on Zach. and Evagr. On the case of Amphilochius' response see also Blaudeau 2006b, 157 n.114 and section C below, n.77. Whitby 2000a, 92 n.119, is more sceptical as to Evagr.'s reliability, although it is hard to see why the historian would falsely attribute something to Zach. Ginter 2001 argues that Evagr. also made use of Zach.'s *V. Sev.* when dealing with Anastasius' reign and suggests that he was more influenced by him than Allen allows.

81 Cf. Allen 1980, 477–8.

82 See Allen 1980, 478–9.

83 The view of Allen 1980, 479.

84 See Allen 1980, 480.

85 See Allen 1980, 482–4 on this case, with Whitby 2000a, 153 n.59, Blaudeau 2006a, 667; cf. PZ v n.142.

Table 2

<i>Pseudo-Zach. Mich. Syr.</i>		<i>Evagrius</i>
iii.1	viii.10 (more detail)	ii.2 Z
iii.1 (end)–2	viii.12	ii.5
iii.3	viii.12	ii.5
iii.4	viii.12	
iii.5	viii.12	
iii.6	viii.12	
iii.7	viii.12	
iii.8	viii.12	
iii.9	viii.12	
iii.10		
iii.11	viii.12	
iii.12		
iv.1	ix.1	ii.8 Z
iv.2	ix.1	ii.8 (Z)
iv.3	ix.1	
iv.4		
iv.5	ix.5 (p.144c)	
iv.6	ix.1 (pp.126c ff.)	
iv.7	ix.5 (p.145c, with citations from Amphilochius)	ii.10 Z
iv.8		
iv.9	ix.1 (pp.130–1c)	ii.11
iv.10		
iv.11	ix.1b (p.127), ix.1c (p.131)	
iv.12	ix.1b (pp.128ff.), ix.1c (pp.132ff., second letter)	
v.1	ix.5 (p.145b)	iii.4
v.2	ix.5 (pp.145–6b)	iii.4–5 Z
v.3	ix.5 (p.146b)	iii.5
v.4		iii.5 Z; iii.6 Z
v.5	ix.5 (pp.146–7b)	iii.7 Z; iii.8; iii.11
v.6		iii.12 Z (twice)
v.7		iii.12, brief summary, iii.13
v.8	ix.6 (pp.149–52c)	iii.14
v.9		iii.15, iii.16
v.10		
v.11		
v.12		

<i>Pseudo-Zach. Mich. Syr.</i>		<i>Evagrius</i>
		iii.18Z
vi.1	ix.6 (pp.152–3c)	iii.22
vi.2		iii.22
vi.3		
vi.4		iii.22
vi.5		iii.23
vi.6		iii.23
vi.7	ix.6 (p.153c)	

One further potential trace of Zachariah's work in subsequent sources deserves to be mentioned. Brooks long ago observed that there are a few brief sections in PZ iii.1 for which almost *verbatim* parallels may be found in Pseudo-Dionysius (PD) of Tel-Mahre's chronicle, e.g. concerning the baleful influence exercised by Theodoret at Chalcedon. Jan van Ginkel argues persuasively that the most plausible explanation for this is that both PZ and John of Ephesus, here PD's source, drew on Zachariah's work.⁸⁶

We must finish this brief section by stressing the uncertainty that attends any conclusions about Zachariah's work, given how it must be reconstructed from a variety of sources. As to how much has been lost, Warren Treadgold is likely to be correct when he asserts that 'we probably have nearly all the substance of the original history and more than half its contents,' although the statement is no more than an inference.⁸⁷ For the purposes of our translation of PZ's work, it is perhaps sufficient for the reader to be aware that what they find in books iii to vi cannot be simply interpreted as 'Zachariah': some parts, as we have seen, have been added by PZ, while still others have been omitted. It follows that caution must be exercised in assessing his work and his approach: to cite but one case, the fact that, as Evagrius shows, he went into some detail about John Talaia's mission to Rome and the excommunication of Acacius indicates that we should not suppose his horizons to have been narrower than they really were. A translator into Syriac, on the other hand, may have suppressed details about Rome that he felt were of no interest to his readership.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ Brooks in PZV i, iii–iv, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 584, van Ginkel 1995, 64–5. We have offered a tentative diagram of this relationship in Greatrex 2009. See further C (4) below.

⁸⁷ Treadgold 2007, 168.

⁸⁸ We thus have some doubts as to the approach of Blaudeau 2006a, 581, who calculates the number of chapters assigned to different parts of the empire in Zach.'s work on the basis of what survives in PZ.

(v) Conclusion

The precise contours of Zachariah's work elude definitive analysis. From what remains in PZ and the allusions in later historians, however, a few conclusions may be offered. First, Zachariah's work was that of a moderate anti-Chalcedonian who believed in the *Henoticon* as a solution to the divisions that had rent the empire; furthermore, it has a perceptibly Alexandrian bias. His heroes are above all the patriarchs Timothy Aelurus and Peter Mongus, who strove to unite opposition to Chalcedon despite the extremism of certain supporters and the Eutychianism of others. Those who took the opposite line, such as Juvenal of Jerusalem or John Talaia, emerge as over-ambitious and clearly unsaintly figures, just like the patriarch Acacius of Constantinople (v.5a) or the would-be agitator Cyrus in Alexandria (v.9a).⁸⁹ Zachariah's moderate line reflects well the prevailing trend of this period: the *Henoticon*, which he manages to associate more with the patriarch Martyrius of Jerusalem (v.6) and Peter Mongus (v.7e) than Acacius, its real initiator, seemed to represent the best chance of resolving the disputes that had raged in the wake of Chalcedon.⁹⁰ In the longer term, however, this moderate line broke down, as it failed to satisfy either supporters of the council, particularly in Constantinople, or the growing number of hard-line opponents. By the 510s, under the influence of Severus and others, Anastasius had moved towards a definitive condemnation of Chalcedon, thus polarising the empire and provoking serious disturbances in the imperial capital.⁹¹ Zachariah's work is thus quite representative of its time and would no doubt have been very different had it appeared only twenty years later. We may speculate further that he was disappointed by the hardening of attitudes during Anastasius' reign, which perhaps led certain of his erstwhile comrades to doubt his commitment to

89 See Blaudeau 2006a, 588–95, for a detailed consideration of the villains in Zach.'s work, 603–10, on the Alexandrian patriarchs and those more favourably presented. Cf. Whitby 2003, 464–6. Watts 2010, 248, perceives little support for Peter in Zach.'s works, however.

90 Cf. Frend 1972, 177–201, Gray 1979, 28–38, Haarer 2006, 123–4, Blaudeau 2006a, 613. Blaudeau 2006a, 606, notes how Zach. associates holy men such as Peter the Iberian with Peter Mongus, thus portraying them as perhaps more moderate than they were; cf. in more detail Blaudeau 2001b and Bitton-Ashkelony and Kofsky 2006, 29 with n.138 on Zach.'s portrayal of Peter the Iberian in the *V. Isa*.

91 See Blaudeau 2001b, 89–90, Haarer 2006, 139–62, Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 233–5, Meier 2009, 257–9. In this context it is worth noting how critical of Peter Mongus Severus was, in particular of his contacts with those who had failed to condemn Chalcedon, *Sel. Lett.*, ep.iv.2 (287–9/254–6) although he moderated his stance upon becoming patriarch, cf. Blaudeau 2001a, 356.

the anti-Chalcedonian cause.⁹²

Second, his work is indubitably an *Ecclesiastical History* in the tradition of Eusebius and his continuators. To what extent it is modelled on Eusebius' work is difficult to determine: Philippe Blaudeau has suggested, for instance, that he consciously models his treatment of Timothy Aelurus on Eusebius' portrayal of the archbishop Dionysius of Alexandria.⁹³ In his focus on doctrinal matters, he takes after Theodoret more than Socrates or Sozomen; also like Theodoret, he avoids secular events almost entirely, even for the period closest to his own day. Like his predecessors, Zachariah is sparing in accounts of miracles, and those that are related naturally redound to the credit of anti-Chalcedonians.⁹⁴ Third, the work enjoyed a good circulation and was no doubt intended as part of a wider campaign to urge Anastasius to continue Zeno's support for the *Henoticon*; more specifically he may have hoped to encourage Alexandrian involvement in church politics and to counteract the efforts being deployed by the patriarch Euphemius of Constantinople to rally support for Chalcedon.⁹⁵ The popularity of the work may safely be inferred from the fact that Evagrius on numerous occasions deliberately sets out to refute it, thus demonstrating that he had access to a copy of it one century later. It may also have encouraged other anti-Chalcedonians to compose their own works: a certain John Diakrinomenos ('the hesitant', referring to his moderate anti-Chalcedonian viewpoint) in Constantinople also wrote up an *Ecclesiastical History* in the 510s, which covers the period from 431 probably to 512. He is likely to have drawn extensively on Zachariah's work, although the few fragments that survive are insufficient to permit any firm conclusions; he also devoted more

92 Blaudeau 2006a, 559 n.352, notes that Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 73 (p.128), recounts an anecdote in which Isaiah (of Gaza) appeared in a dream to Zach. and urged him to flee contact with the Chalcedonians, which might indicate that he did still have such contacts, cf. n.38 above. It might also be significant that his biography of Severus fails to cover his period as patriarch and is less detailed for the preceding years, the time in which he developed a tougher line in dealing with those (like his predecessor Flavian) for whom the *Henoticon* sufficed.

93 Blaudeau 2006a, 518 n.124. Both were taken under constraint to Taphosirion (Eus. *HE* vi.40, PZ iv.1b) and generous in their treatment of penitents, but these parallels seem a little tenuous. A possible allusion at iv.2 (the death of Proterius) to Socr. *HE* iii.2 seems more plausible, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 519. Blaudeau also detects parallels between Zach.'s preface and Socrates', *ibid.*, 521.

94 So Whitby 2003, 465–6, Blaudeau 2006a, 527–32.

95 So Blaudeau 2006a, 532, 554–5, 560–3. Allen 1980, 488, points out that Evagrius knew of no other work (including even that of Theodore Lector) that took over where the Theodosian church historians left off. On Euphemius' activities see Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 227–8.

attention to secular matters.⁹⁶ Theodore Lector, whose own *Ecclesiastical History* was published during the reign of the Emperor Justin I (518–527) and takes a strongly Chalcedonian line, also sought to reject certain points made in Zachariah's work.⁹⁷ It seems probable that Zachariah intended his work for a general readership, i.e. functionaries like himself, whether they worked in the imperial bureaucracy or in the church. As Blaudeau remarks, this tier of modest functionaries, many of whom will have had a legal career like Zachariah's, comprised an important sector of the population, whose opinions could prove influential.⁹⁸

96 On John see Treadgold 2007, 168–9, cf. Blaudeau 2001b for more detail; the brief fragments of his work may be found in Hansen's edition of Theodore Lector, 152–7. Given the frequent references to Antioch in his work (e.g. to the patriarchs Peter the Fuller and Calendion), he may have sought to compensate for Zach.'s skimpy treatment of this region; he is also more interested in the eastern frontier.

97 See Blaudeau 2006a, 540–1, 571, 656–8.

98 Blaudeau 2006a, 560.

C. PSEUDO-ZACHARIAH

(1) Pseudo-Zachariah himself

While we are relatively well informed about the church historian Zachariah of Mytilene, our information about 'Pseudo-Zachariah' (henceforth PZ) is minimal. It is generally supposed that he was a monk of Amida, who had access to good sources, perhaps in the cathedral library, probably including the books assembled by Mara of Amida. He specifies himself that he undertook his work at the urging of his superior, hoping thereby to instruct the faithful.¹ Since we find the date of 880 of the Seleucid era in the first book (i.1 and i.3), i.e. A.D. 568/9, it is supposed that he composed the work, incorporating Zachariah's *Ecclesiastical History*, at this point, fastening onto it, as it were, a heterogeneous assortment of notices, both secular and ecclesiastical. This work was in turn mined by later Syriac sources, such as Michael the Syrian and Barhebraeus, who made the mistake of attributing the entire composition to Zachariah. For this reason its author is now referred to as Pseudo-Zachariah.²

Little work has been carried out on Pseudo-Zachariah's sources, particularly if one compares his work to that of his approximate contemporary, John of Ephesus: John has been the focus of painstaking work by both Jan van Ginkel and Witold Witakowski, the latter concentrating on Pseudo-Dionysius' (henceforth PD) use of the sixth-century church historian in his eighth-century chronicle.³ John himself is an almost precise contemporary of PZ: indeed, at almost the same moment as PZ brought out his work, John published the second part of his extensive *Ecclesiastical History*, which probably covered the period from 450 to the reign of Justin II. He continued to work after this, eventually producing a third part, which took the narrative

1 See p.38 below on this. Krüger 1908, 596, suggested that he was a monk of the monastery of St John at Amida, presumably meaning the monastery of John of Urtâyê, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 535, PZ vii.4a. See also Kugener 1900b, 202–3. On PZ's commission see i.7 (56/40), cited at (3)(vii)(b) below and ii.0b (in section F).

2 Witakowski, forthcoming, suggests that the name of the compiler of the whole work was lost at an early stage, probably even before the production of our main manuscript (A) c.600. Through an easy confusion of names, the work was sometimes ascribed to Zachariah of Melitene (in Armenia) rather than of Mytilene (on the isle of Lesbos), cf. Witakowski, *art. cit.*, Honigsmann 1953c, 195–7 (explaining how the confusion arose) and below (6).

3 See van Ginkel 1995, which will lead to a monograph and a new tr. of the *HE*, Witakowski 1991, 1996a, 1996b. We have benefited enormously, however, from an as yet unpublished article of Witold Witakowski on Pseudo-Zachariah (Witakowski, forthcoming). There is much also on John of Ephesus in Menze 2008a, cf. idem 2008c.

up to 588, and which has mostly survived in its original form. Unlike PZ, however, John was a leading figure in the anti-Chalcedonian movement with extensive contacts at the imperial court; he spent much of the latter part of his life in Constantinople. He could thus draw both on his contacts there and on his extensive personal experiences, e.g. of the persecution of the anti-Chalcedonians in the vicinity of Amida in the late 520s, in drawing up his historical works, as well as his *Lives of the Eastern Saints*.⁴

The most extensive discussion of Pseudo-Zachariah's sources may be found in the introduction (by Krüger) of Ahrens and Krüger's German translation of 1899. Krüger clearly devoted much energy to establishing PZ's sources, but found himself unable to reach any definitive conclusions.⁵ In our section below we shall attempt to go into the matter in somewhat greater detail than Krüger, but it must be admitted from the outset that, just as in 1899, more detailed work remains to be done.

(2) The work of PZ

Before we undertake a detailed analysis of the elements that comprised PZ's work we should pose several questions. First, what should we call the work? Some scholars have considered it to be a chronicle, others an ecclesiastical history. In 2006 we advanced various arguments in favour of the notion that it should be considered as the latter: it undoubtedly bears more resemblance to this genre than to that of the chronicle, particularly with its specific allusions to Eusebius, Socrates and Theodoret, and in the fact that it picks up where (it claims) the last two left off.⁶ This seems also to have been the impression he gave to those who read or copied his work: Witold Witakowski notes that the label *Ecclesiastical History* is found as a title on several folios of our principal manuscript (A), including parts not derived from Zachariah; likewise, in manuscript V, which contains some extracts

4 See van Ginkel 1995, 27–37, 46, cf. Greatrex 2006, 40 and n.14, drawing attention to the close interval between the publication of the works of John of Ephesus and PZ. Van Ginkel 1998a, 500, suggests that part two of John's *Ecclesiastical History* began rather in c.440, at the point at which Socrates' account ended, cf. idem 1995, 48.

5 AK xxxiv, cf. xli.

6 See Greatrex 2006, 44 and n.35 with the references there. It is worth adding to the points made there that PZ, unlike Syriac chroniclers generally, makes little effort to date events, e.g. by inserting an AG date. Despite the wealth of detail, for instance, about the siege of Amida (vii.3–4), he nowhere actually reports the year it took place (unlike the retelling of the siege in the *Narrationes Variae*, 332/261, which specifically places the siege in AG 817). See Debié 2003, 612.

from PZ, two citations are headed ‘from the *Ecclesiastical [History]* of Zachariah’.⁷ The author, however, contents himself with describing his own work as ‘a volume of narratives of actions that occurred in the world’, which clearly is extremely broad. Hence Witakowski, following Kugener, has proposed referring to it instead as a ‘Miscellaneous History’, which we find persuasive. It is worth noting that similar difficulties attend the work of John Malalas, although it is generally referred to as a chronicle: as Warren Treadgold points out, his preface refers rather to an *enkyklion*, a term perhaps better translated as ‘general history’.⁸

Second, and more fundamentally, what did PZ write? The list of sources that we present below seems, by its very length, to shunt PZ aside. Little room is left for PZ himself. This is an extremely complex issue, and one where no final certainty is attainable. We should like to propose, despite this, that we should see PZ as more of a compiler than an author, someone who drew together a heterogeneous collection of stories and accounts, welding them into this miscellaneous history. It is possible that the label ‘PZ’ is therefore somewhat unhelpful, since it rather implies a single authorship of the work outside books iii-vi; nevertheless, because it has been employed so frequently in scholarship and is convenient, we shall continue to use it. Our suggestion would make PZ more like PD and less like (for instance) John of Ephesus or Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, who are closer to him chronologically. Just as PD compiled his chronicle from disparate elements, including Pseudo-Joshua’s entire narrative of the Anastasian war, itself long enough to comprise one TTH volume, so PZ brought together long and short narratives

7 Witakowski, forthcoming, Wright 1872, 1046, Blaudeau 2006a, 520; Brooks in PZT, i, iii on MS V (Vat. Syr. 145, c.800), cf. n.86 below. As we noted in Greatrex 2006, 46 and n.47, this manuscript offers extracts from Socrates and Theodoret before its selection from PZ. For comparanda see Watt 1999b, 319, noting the problem of translating the title of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite’s work, and 326–7, stressing that there was an interest in Syriac historiography for secular as well as ecclesiastical affairs, to which PZ’s narrative in vii–ix certainly attests; cf. Debié 2009b, 13–14.

8 See Witakowski, forthcoming, cf. Kugener 1900b, Petit 1900, 527, Krüger 1908, 596. For the sake of brevity and simplicity, however, we have preferred to use the term ‘chronicle’ in the official title of our translation. Blaudeau 2006a, 535 n.209, notes that Muriel Debié considers PZ’s work, like Zach.’s, to be an ecclesiastical history, but he rightly finds this supposition problematic. Cf. Debié 2006, 23–4, eadem 2009b, 25–7, arguing that Evagrius, John of Ephesus and PZ represent the last instances of ecclesiastical historiography, a genre that had run its course as the church fragmented. On the case of Malalas see Treadgold 2007, 235 and the work’s preface; Burgess and Kulikowski 2010, ch.1, deal more broadly with the issue, arguing that Mal.’s work should be categorised as a *Breviarium* rather than as a chronicle.

into his *Miscellaneous History*.⁹ This view is in line with what PZ himself states at i.1 (cf. ii.0, where he mentions other sources, such as *hypomnēmata* and *pepragmena* [memoranda and acts], doubtless because he used them in this book for the church councils):

How right and fitting it is for eager and discerning readers that, following on from the three ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates and Theodoret, the succeeding events that took place at different times, that are scattered about and not collected together in a single volume, should be assembled and set down, based on documents, or letters, or reliable oral sources. This will be for the benefit of the faithful and those who have a concern for excellence and beauty of soul.¹⁰

Thus the four books of Zachariah were kept together as a whole, although they were supplemented by his chronicle source. To this core was added an eclectic collection of documents, mostly of Amidene provenance, but the work of a number of individuals. Some of them could have been already joined together when he found them, such as books vii-x.¹¹ The so-called *Narrationes Variae*, edited and translated among the Syriac *Chronica minora*, refer to an (anonymous) church history of Amida, which may well have contained at least some of the information provided by PZ.¹²

9 See Witakowski 1987, 124–38, esp. 136 on PD's methods. Other parallels would be Michael the Syrian in the twelfth century (on whom see Weltecke 2003, 135–52) and Theophanes in the ninth (see Mango and Scott 1996, lxxiv, quoted at the start of the next section). As in the case of PD, this can lead to a certain amount of repetition. If our arguments immediately below about PZ vii.8 and vii.11 being later additions are accepted, this sort of insertion of a document led to the same sort of repetition with PZ as it did with PD and Pseudo-Joshua's work, which was itself summarised by John of Ephesus and inserted likewise in PD's work: see Witakowski 1987, 135. For a similar judgement of PZ as more compiler than author see already Hilgenfeld 1904, 573: 'Auch in den übrigen Büchern [i-ii, vii-xii] hat er meist Urkunden und Berichte von Augenzeugen einfach zusammengestellt.'

10 We here suppose that this preface is that of PZ himself. Witakowski, forthcoming, believes it rather to be Zach.'s, taken over by PZ. Although this possibility cannot be excluded, the reference to the sort of documents mentioned at ii.0 and then later in ii seems to make it more likely that it is PZ's preface, but of course he could easily have been influenced in his wording by Zach.'s.

11 It is striking that while at the end of ii PZ looks forward to what he will recount in iii, at i.1 he promises (cf. i.3) to bring his account up to AG 880 (568/9). Beyond the start of book vii, on the other hand, there are few overt signs of editorial intervention, save for the odd justification of the inclusion or exclusion of material (vii.7c for the former, ix.13f for the latter). One might therefore infer from this that much of vii-ix at least was already assembled in some form or other before being taken over by PZ.

12 *Chronica minora*, 331.3/260, cf. Witakowski 1991, 266, who suggests that this source (like PD) drew on John of Ephesus, in this case for the outbreak of madness in Amida in the

There is little that can be said beyond this that is not (still more) speculative. We would suggest that PZ may well himself have added vii.8 and vii.11, which incorporate original letters, to book vii on the grounds that they are quite superfluous to the narrative. The original author of book vii took both documents into account in drawing up his narrative, but evidently felt it unnecessary to quote them *in extenso*; hence there is much repetition between vii.7 and vii.8, and again between vii.11 and vii.12, where a fuller (or at any rate different) account follows a briefer description of events. We would argue that vii.7c represents PZ's insertion, justifying his inclusion of the entire letter – for which the modern historian has much occasion to be grateful to him. We shall comment further below on PZ's choice of material, in which his concern for the edification of his brothers is clear, leading in turn to the inclusion of certain documents as well as on occasion to the suppression of details readily available elsewhere.

One further suggestion may be offered in our search for PZ. The only two unidentified letters in the whole work come at i.2–3, right at the very outset. The first correspondent is troubled by chronological discrepancies in the genealogies of the Old Testament, a problem resolved with considerable erudition by his respondent; we might compare the opening of Jacob of Edessa's chronography, in which the author criticises Eusebius for mistakenly adding on three years at the end of his canons, after which he presents his own lists of Macedonian and subsequent rulers.¹³ Our proposal is that the learned respondent may be the compiler of the whole work, PZ himself, which explains why he leaves the two letters anonymous: from his addresses to his patron (i.7, 56–7/40, cf. ii.0, 104/72) it is clear that he seeks to portray himself as a humble man. The first letter thus provides a justification for the learned discussion of chronology that follows. Our chief ground for propounding this hypothesis, however, lies in an unfortunately lacunose

late 550s, and assigned it a date of AG 871. Two extracts from a fifteenth-century manuscript in Berlin, Sachau 315, are of particular interest in this connection. The first, described as coming from an 'ecclesiastical history', is the description of the outbreak of madness; the second follows PZ very closely in its account of the fall of Amida to the Persians in 503, stressing the moralising element. See *Chronica minora*, 331–5/260–3 with Debié 2003, 617–18. Whether this second narrative is derived directly from PZ vii is uncertain, since it gives (e.g.) an AG date (817) for the event and differs in certain details, such as estimating the number of Roman dead at 180,000, not 80,000, and calling the Roman leader who besieged the city subsequently Sergius, not Celer; Debié is probably right, however, to suppose that PZ is the source.

13 Jac. Ede. *Chr.* 277–8/209, as noted by Witakowski 2008, 33–4. Debié 2009b, 21–6, offers a useful discussion of the influence of Eusebius' *Chronicle* and his *Ecclesiastical History* on the Syriac tradition.

passage within i.3 which oddly echoes i.1, since it brings up again the date AG 880, offering a calculation of the time elapsed from Adam to this year (5908 years).¹⁴ He continues, noting that these events were narrated in the Old and New Testaments, then in the chronicle of Eusebius up to Constantine, then in the church histories of Socrates and Theodoret, up to the 32nd year of Theodosius II. He goes on, ‘And from this [time] until today, [insofar as] we are now able ... [lacuna]... in succession, we quickly composed’ (i, 17/10–12). This is also the claim of the author in i.1, who refers to the same three authors (admittedly to the ecclesiastical histories of all three, rather than the chronicle of Eusebius), while also asserting that his work will cover up to the year AG 880 (i.1, 5–6/3–4). The simplest way of accounting for this remarkable repetition, we propose, is to infer that the authors of each section are one and the same. Alternatively, but somewhat less plausibly, one could argue for the intervention of a second compiler here, the author of i.1, who just took over a freshly published work and incorporated it into his own.

One last point remains to be discussed in this section. Where might PZ have found these various sources? At least in this case an answer is ready to hand, as is related at viii.5b:

This Mara [the anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Amida, expelled from his see probably in 521] was educated in every principle and virtue of the soul from his youth by Shmuni and Marutha, his sober, chaste, and faithful sisters. After a short period of time in his see he was banished to Petra, and from Petra to Alexandria. He was there for a while and assembled a library with many wonderful books, and in them is an abundance of learning and great benefit for the diligent and discerning lovers of learning. These were transferred to the treasury of the church in Amida after the man’s death. The entire account of the matter [80] I have omitted, so as not to cause outrage by blaming one or praising another; whatever the truth of the matter may be, I have recounted [it] without falsification.

Both John of Ephesus, in his *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, and PD (deriving his information from John’s *Ecclesiastical History*) corroborate Mara’s various moves. It is worth highlighting the attention paid to Mara by both PZ and John: the latter was a friend of the *notarius* and *syncellus* Stephen, who twice interceded with Theodora on Mara’s behalf, and even accompanied both Stephen and the holy man Thomas as far as Antioch when they were

¹⁴ In fact, as Nöldeke points out in AK 296, there is an error of calculation: the author’s figures add up to 5980 years, not 5908. Whichever figure one accepts, one can understand why the ‘pessimist’, noted below at (3)(x), was concerned about an imminent end of the world; likewise the more optimistic (but nonetheless eschatologically minded) author of the final section of the surviving work, discussed below at (3)(vii)(k).

summoned by the empress around 532. Similar accounts by John and PZ may thus be partly the result of their shared background and their contacts in and connections to Amida, near which John began his monastic career.¹⁵ We prefer this explanation for the evident similarities between their two works in several instances to the theory that John drew on PZ, or vice versa, a debate that has continued since 1899 without ever reaching a certain conclusion. Both works contain much that is not to be found in the other, and indeed on several occasions (e.g. in the case of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus) actually diverge from one another, which makes the idea of a common (Amidene) source – to which both added independent information – more plausible.¹⁶ As for Mara, because he was an anti-Chalcedonian, he was banished first to Petra, and then, around 524, to Alexandria, where he died, perhaps in 532, perhaps somewhat later. Nearly all scholars who have worked on PZ have concluded, not unreasonably, that the library built up by Mara, and here specifically mentioned by PZ, must have been instrumental in the preparation of his work.¹⁷ If we suppose, however, that Mara's library was transferred from Egypt to Amida after his death at some point in the 530s, it follows that it cannot have contained material used in books ix and following, and, given the Amidene focus of book vii, it is unlikely that it too could have originated in Alexandria. Hence, although the library of Mara was clearly an important element in the Amidene church, it cannot have furnished PZ with all the material he required for his work.

15 See Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 188–9, 197 (where John calls Mara his spiritual father), 207, with van Ginkel 1995, 28, Menze 2008a, 213–15. Cf. Greatrex 2006, 41 (on Donatus, mentioned at vii.1a, another Amidene who travelled to Constantinople).

16 AK xli–xliv argues strenuously that PZ did not draw on John of Ephesus, insisting that the latter published his work after PZ in any case, cf. Petit 1900, 529, Krüger 1900, 285; *contra*, Brooks in HB, 5–6. Van Ginkel 1995, 62–3, argues that it is unlikely that John used PZ, a theory argued for by Witakowski 1991, 269–70. The similarities discussed by Witakowski, however, can equally well be explained by the use of common sources, as Krüger long ago argued in AK xliv. See too Rist 2002, 93 and n.67, Blaudeau 2006a, 540, Debié 2003, 616. Van Ginkel 1998a, 500–1, argues that both may also have drawn on the (lost) 'more elaborate' version of *Chr. Ede*.

17 Cf. Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 194–5, PD ii, 32/31 and our commentary at viii.5b. For PZ's use of Mara's library cf. AK xvii–xviii, Rist 2002, 91, Greatrex 2006, 41–2, where we noted the strong Egyptian flavour of the four books taken from Zachariah himself: if the Syriac version of Zach. to which PZ had access (cf. [3][i] below) was of Alexandrian provenance, this might account for this aspect, cf. Greatrex, *art. cit.*, 49 n.22. On the probable attachment of Mara's library to the church in Amida see Menze 2008a, 137, following Mundell 1982, 6.

(3) PZ's sources

As Cyril Mango and Roger Scott state in the introduction to their translation of the ninth-century *Chronicle* of Theophanes, 'Granted that the *Chronicle* is a file [of extracts from earlier sources], its study is in a very real sense the study of its sources'. Even if, as we have seen, it is doubtful whether we should term PZ's work a chronicle, the same approach is required, and it is for this reason that we shall investigate his sources in some depth.¹⁸

(i) Most obviously, **the *Ecclesiastical History of Zachariah of Mytilene***, from whom books iii to vi are largely drawn.¹⁹ Yet even this is not as straightforward as one might hope. Two possibilities must be canvassed as to how PZ came to use Zachariah's work. On the one hand, we might suppose that PZ was proficient in Greek – as some of his rather critical remarks on the prolixity of the Greeks might seem to imply (e.g. at iv.6d) – or, on the other, it is possible that he employed an earlier Syriac translation, which he merely abridged.²⁰ Given what we have seen of the considerable cuts made to Zachariah's work by PZ, the latter appears to be the most plausible hypothesis: first the translator excised sections of lesser interest to the Syriac reader, e.g. concerning western matters, and then PZ himself scaled back the number of documents included or abridged them. A further complication arises, to be dealt with below, as to who exactly made the cuts in the documents presented: as we shall discuss below (C [4], cf. B [4][iii]), Michael the Syrian on at least one occasion (when covering events in PZ iii-vi) provides extracts from a letter that is not to be found in our manuscript of PZ. It is possible therefore that Michael had at his disposal a fuller version of Zach. than that which PZ used (or at any rate transmitted); on the other hand, given that Michael also has fuller versions of material from later in PZ's work (see [4] below), it is more likely that his version of PZ (rather than of just Zach.) was more complete.²¹

18 Quotation from Mango and Scott 1996, lxxiv, cf. Croke 2001, 171, describing the methodology of a chronicler in preparing his work.

19 At one stage it was thought that Zach.'s work also lay behind PZ vii, cf. Land 1870, xii, with Blaudeau 2006a, 545, but already in 1899 Krüger realised that this view was mistaken. Despite this, modern scholars are still sometimes fooled into thinking that vii belongs to Zach., cf. e.g. Motta 2003, 214.

20 This is the suggestion of Jan van Ginkel, as noted by Weltecke 2003, 43 n.82. Rist 2002, 97, argues that an abridgement (of Zach.) by PZ 'seems not unlikely': at i.1, section 'I', PZ seems to envisage undertaking translations himself.

21 Van Ginkel 1995, 64, supports the latter view. The two possibilities noted above are not,

(ii) **A chronicle.** This chronicle is specifically mentioned by PZ in two places, at ii.1 (p.114/79) and at iv.0d. From these two instances it is clear that the chronicle indicated the length of the reigns of emperors; it is possible therefore that it was no more than a bare list of the type one finds, for instance, in Nicephorus' *Chronographeion syntomon* of the mid-ninth century.²² At ii.1, however, PZ places the awakening of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus in the 38th year of Theodosius II's reign, during the 304th Olympiad. Elsewhere he refers to the 32nd year of Theodosius II's reign (i.1, i.3), while Olympiads resurface at ii.5 (Olympiad 308, i.e. A.D. 453–7), iii.12b (305, i.e. 441–4), vii.1a (324, i.e. 517–20), ix.0a and ix.1a (both 327, i.e. 529–32), and xii.7j (Olympiad 333, i.e. 553–6). It seems more plausible to infer therefore that the chronicle to which PZ had access, and which he used as a sort of framework for his work, was of a more standard type, closer to the Eusebian model. Indeed, in the entry on the Seven Sleepers (ii.1), PZ specifically states, 'The emperor Decius died after a reign of one year and three months; he was killed with his son near Beruta; and after him reigned Gallus and (V)olusianus, as the chronicle reports.'²³ It thus furnished him with year-by-year dates with the regnal year of the emperor in question and the Olympiad dating. Socrates, a church historian with whom PZ was familiar, regularly included Olympiad dates in his work, although, as has been noticed, there

of course, mutually exclusive. Flusin 1996, 38–44, discusses the translations of both Zach. and his contemporary John Rufus into Syriac and other languages, a process encouraged by Justinian's ban in 536 on the copying of works of Severus and his followers; the measure naturally led to the disappearance of the texts in Greek.

22 Theophanes also drew on such a source, indeed probably the same source as Nicephorus, for his list of rulers (and patriarchs) at the start of each year, cf. de Boor 1880, xlvii, Mango and Scott 1996, lxxvii–lxxiv; see also Mango 1990, 2–4 and section (iii)(b) below. Eusebius was also the originator of this genre, which was called chronography (as opposed to the *chronici canones*, on which see the next note). See Barnes 1981, 113–15, on Eusebius' *Chronography*, with Karst's tr. of the Armenian version of the work, 1–143. See too Debié 2006, 19–22, on the transmission of Eusebius' lists in the Syriac tradition; this is relevant in particular to PZ i.3, where a letter reproduced by PZ analyses the chronology of patriarchs from Adam onwards, a period deliberately left to one side by Eusebius (who started with Abraham).

23 PZ i, 114/79. Cf. Jerome, *Chr.*, 218^b, which gives exactly the same length of reign of Decius, reports the death of the emperor and his son at Abritus, and the following reign of Gallus and Volusianus. Of course, Eusebius' chronicle (i.e. the canons) has not survived, but its form and contents are clear enough from his continuators. See Mosshammer 1979, 28–83, Burgess 1999, 21–58, with Witakowski 1999/2000, 424–8. Witakowski notes the possible existence of a Syriac translation of Eusebius' chronicle in the sixth century, cf. Greatrex 2006, 51 n.43 for more details on this and further references. Peeters 1923, 381, considers that PZ's chronicle must here have been dependent on a passion, which seems an unnecessary inference.

are inconsistencies within them.²⁴ The seventh-century Syriac chronicle of Jacob of Edessa, which itself drew on PZ's work, operated on just such a system, taking over where Eusebius' chronicle left off. The seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* also used a framework of Olympiad years, alongside regnal years and consulships.²⁵

It is likely therefore that this chronicle source also offered lemmata, short annual entries that reported notable events, such as natural disasters or significant political developments. PZ offers a round-up of such entries in several places, at the end of ii.5, at iii.12a and at vi.6e. The fullest of these occurs at ii.5, just after PZ explains that he will draw on Zachariah's work for the next book. He then goes on:

- (a) The body of the holy bishop John, called Chrysostomos, was returned from (the place of his) exile, and was held in honour in Constantinople with a procession;
- (b) the Empress Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius, went to Jerusalem for the purpose of prayer, and returned; and then she died.
- (c) ZRZYRKWS (i.e. Gaisericus/Geiseric) took Carthage in Africa and ruled there.
- (d) The *stratêlatês* John was killed by the servants of Areobindus.
- (e) There were earthquakes in various places;
- (f) and then Theodosius died.

PZ does not offer a specific date for any of these events, but the implication is that they all occurred within the timespan of the second book, i.e. between 440 and 450. He may have deliberately not bothered to date them more precisely; alternatively, his chronicle may not have offered enough precision, since these lemmata could often shift forwards and backwards in the chronological tables, depending on how careful scribes were and how much space they could find for these entries among the regnal and Olympiad years.²⁶ It is doubtful whether we can proceed much further. PZ's chronicle focuses on the eastern empire, with a few entries on western affairs. In the case of the entries noted above, one can find similar descriptions in the chronicle of Marcellinus *comes*, composed in Latin in Constantinople during the 520s. His equivalent entries for the events described above

24 See van Nuffelen 2004a; cf. Burgess 1999, 28–9, Croke 2001, 147–8, on the Olympiad system more generally.

25 See Witakowski 2008 on Jacob's chronicle. Whitby and Whitby 1989, xvii–xviii, Mango and Scott 1996, liii, on *Chr. Pasch.* PD uses Olympiads too, but generally only at 'synchronization points' for particularly important events, cf. Witakowski 1987, 121–2.

26 Cf. Witakowski 1999/2000, 425–6, Burgess 2006. Michael Whitby points out to us that Mal.'s *Chronicle* for the reign of Theodosius II (14.1–27) likewise offers very few dates.

occur at (a) 438.2, (b) 439.2, (c) 439.3, (d) 441.2, (e) 447.1, (f) 450.1. The *Chronicon Paschale* offers parallels for some, but not all, the entries; its spelling of Geiseric, however, as Zinzirikhos (p.583), is rather closer to PZ's than is Marcellinus'. Lastly, one should note that PZ is in error in entry (b): Eudocia indeed returned to Constantinople after her first visit to Jerusalem, but then, in 444, as Marcellinus relates, she left the capital definitively and went to Jerusalem *moritura*, i.e. where she died (in 460). PZ (or his source) may thus have conflated two entries.²⁷

We are not proposing that PZ drew on Marcellinus. We may suggest, however, that he had access to some sort of chronicle that shared many entries with Marcellinus. Muriel Debié has argued convincingly in favour of the existence of city archives in the eastern provinces, notably at Edessa, where lists of bishops, dates of important events and the like were preserved.²⁸ It is thus perfectly plausible to envisage that PZ found in Amida a chronicle source that he exploited in a few places; the fact that it last surfaces at the end of book vi may indicate that it was not updated after this point.²⁹

Before proceeding to deal with our next source, bishop lists, it is worth noting that PZ's work contains occasional datings by the Seleucid era, i.e. from 1 October 312 B.C. To be more precise, we find these references at i.1 and i.3 (both to 880), at ii.5 (where the Council of Chalcedon is dated to 764, cf. iii.0), vi.6e (Zeno's death in 802, cf. vii.1a), vii.10a (the council of Sidon in 823), vii.13a (the death of Ariadne in 824) viii.1a (the death of

27 For the entries at iii.12a parallels are harder to adduce. Marcellinus' entry for a.459 on Isaac of Antioch (the Isaac referred to by PZ at i.9) alludes to the earthquake of 458 in the city; PZ's next entry, on 'Sulifus', is somewhat obscure (cf. n.165 there); Marcellinus places the death of Aspar in 471. The regnal dates offered on this occasion by PZ are (apart from the first one) highly inaccurate. The entries at vi.6e are (roughly) paralleled at Marcellinus a.476.1 (uprising of Basiliscus and Marcus), 476.2 (Odoacer seizes Rome), a.484.1 and 488.1 (failed revolt of Illus and Leontius), a.489 (Theoderic takes Rome). Eastern chroniclers often had difficulties with the rapid succession of emperors in the West after Valentinian III's death, cf. Theoph. 109, 118. Page numbers in Theophanes always refer to de Boor's edition.

28 Debié 1999/2000, cf. Croke 2001, 184–5, postulating a common Constantinopolitan source for Marcellinus, the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, with Whitby and Whitby 1989, xvii–xviii and xx–xxi.

29 There is no need to enter into the discussion as to the existence of official city chronicles or not: the notion of such official records is supported by Croke 1990, 182–98, cf. idem 2001, 172–3, 181–6. Burgess 1993, 182–6, cf. idem 2000, 279–84, strongly rejects the notion that in Late Antiquity consular lists and calendars were to be found in central archives for consultation, marshalling convincing evidence for his contention, but he does not deny that *some* records were kept. Certain events were recorded in city archives, as Mal. 18.29 attests, with which one may compare the archives of Edessa. See Burgess 2000, 283 n.90, Debié 1999/2000, 409–10.

Anastasius in 829), viii.3a (the letter of Simeon of Bet Arsham from 835), viii.4b (flooding at Edessa in 836), ix.0a (the accession of Justinian in 838, cf. ix.1a), x.0a (848 and 859, the period covered by the book), and xii.7j (866, offered for a synchronisation). Compared to (for instance) the chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius, the number of such references is very small. In some cases, moreover, the date clearly has come from a document inserted into the work, as in the case of the letter of Simeon and the account of the council of Sidon. As for the remainder, the most likely hypothesis would be that PZ derived them from another source, i.e. *not* the chronicle, which may even have restricted itself to the deaths of imperial figures; the flood at Edessa entry probably comes from a separate documentary source (since it actually gives the day of the flood), while the reference to Chalcedon may likewise derive from a separate work. We do know that chroniclers did seek to synchronise the various sources they used, often somewhat unsuccessfully, and it may be that this is what PZ is attempting, e.g. at vi.6e, where we find both Olympiads and the Seleucid era. It is clear at any rate that his Seleucid era dates came from a different source than those to be found in Pseudo-Dionysius, since they rarely coincide.³⁰

Further precision is not readily obtainable. We conclude that a chronicle was used, one that gave lengths of reigns and Olympiad years at least, and most likely with year by year entries, each with the regnal year of the emperor indicated. Probably it was of the type produced by Eusebius and emulated by Jacob of Edessa; whether it was in Greek or Syriac is impossible to determine.

(iii) **Bishop Lists.** This source may be dealt with more briefly than the enigmatic chronicle. Lists of the principal bishops, i.e. the patriarchs, circulated widely in antiquity and were probably to be found in many cities

30 Zeno's death (491) is put by PZ vi.6e in 802 (correct), by PD ii, 3/3 in 808; they agree in dating Anastasius' death to 829, correctly (PZ viii.1a, PD ii, 15/17); both place the flood at Edessa in 836 (PZ viii.4b, PD ii, 44/41), but they are both here probably drawing on a local Edessene source. See Witakowski 1987, 77, on the mid-sixth century Edessene chronicle, although in this case (ch.89/90) it only gives the year AG 836 and not the actual date for the flood. The accession of Justinian is placed by PZ ix.0a, cf. ix.1a, in 838 (correctly), by PD ii, 53/48, in 842. Both agree on dating Simeon's letter (PZ viii.3a, PD ii, 57/53) to 835, but this date of course comes within the letter itself. Witakowski 1996b, 185, observes that PD starts to use the Seleucid era system (A[nnus] G[raecorum]) after the termination of Eusebius' Chronicle, even when he was drawing his material from Socrates (who did not use it). On the pitfalls of making synchronisms, and in particular of adding AG dates, which were not to be found in official documents, see Debié 1999/2000, 412–13.

of the empire, naturally with greater accuracy for the sees closer to home. They were included in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, as also at the end of Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History*, both cited as sources by PZ. They may indeed have been linked to the diptychs, on which the names of those commemorated by the community in question were recorded, in order that they be read out during the liturgy.³¹ The *Chronographeion syntomon* of Nicephorus provides a series of lists of the patriarchs of the empire, which adds a few brief remarks on certain individuals; it was drawn up, as was another work of the same title, in the mid-ninth century, but the lists of patriarchs of all sees, save Constantinople, do not extend beyond the early seventh century at the latest. These two works and the ninth-century chronicler Theophanes all drew upon the same lists.³² Jacob of Edessa likewise provides such lists; his all conclude in the 570s, perhaps because he was reliant on John of Ephesus for them.³³

Krüger was particularly interested in PZ's lists. Building upon suggestions made by Gelzer, he proposed that they derived ultimately from some sort of anti-Chalcedonian collection held in Alexandria: Dioscorus (vii.15a), mentioned as still being in office, died in 517.³⁴ His speculations may have gone too far, however, since the notice at vii.15a seems more up to date for other parts of the empire, notably Jerusalem. We think it preferable to restrict ourselves to two observations. First, the lists of PD and PZ are strikingly similar and likely to derive from a common source: with PD ii, 2/1–2 (AG 800) we may compare PZ's lists at iv.12mm and vi.7. Both include Ephesus in their surveys, which might support Gelzer's idea of an (anti-Chalcedonian) Egyptian provenance, since it was in the patriarch of Alexandria's interests to support the position of Ephesus against the encroachment of Constantinople (cf. PZ v.4b).³⁵ At PD ii, 15/16–17 we find a further list

31 See Debié 1999/2000, 411, on these lists, as also Witkowski 1996a, xxix, suggesting the diptychs as a possible source. Gelzer 1883, 508, Blaudeau 2006a, 509, on the precedents for such lists, cf. e.g. Euseb. *HE* v.22, ii.24, iii.21, Thdr. *HE* v.40, Socr. *HE* v.3.

32 Niceph. *Chr. Synt.* 116–31 for the period overlapping with PZ. On these lists see de Boor's introduction, xxxiv–vi, suggesting that Nicephorus' came to Constantinople via Jerusalem, given the prominence given to this patriarchate; cf. Mango and Scott 1996, lxxvii–lxxiv.

33 Anti-Chalcedonian Christians had less interest in the holders of Chalcedonian patriarchates, of course. See Mango and Scott 1996, lxxv. Cf. *Chr.* 724, which adds to the name of the bishop his place in the succession of bishops; *Chr.* 846 likewise uses such lists.

34 AK xxxiv–ix, cf. Gelzer 1883, 507–10. Gelzer, however, seems also to have drawn the conclusion that Zachariah's history continued to this point (and not just to the end of vi).

35 Cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 294–301, on Alexandria's relations with Ephesus. Krüger in AK xxxvii–ix highlighted the similarity of these extracts from PD and PZ, cf. Witkowski 1991,

(AG 828), which is very close to that furnished by PZ at vii.15a, just as that at PD ii.15/17 resembles that at PZ viii.6a. Second, Gelzer and Krüger may be right in detecting similarities between PZ's (and hence PD's) lists and those to be found in Nicephorus. Yet as Krüger himself recognised, it is hard to know how much store to put by such a supposition: in some ways, it should not be surprising if there were such a link, given the evidently wide circulation of these lists.³⁶

(iv) We come at last to a more straightforward category, that of **the church historians**. PZ refers on several occasions to his three predecessors, Eusebius, Socrates and Theodoret, all three authors of an *Ecclesiastical History*. Sozomen, we may note, a contemporary of the last two, is not mentioned. All three are referred to at i.1 and i.3, and again at ii.0, where PZ claims that the last two took their accounts up to the 32nd year of Theodosius II's reign; in fact, Socrates did indeed cover events down to 438, but Theodoret concluded his account already in the 420s. There is little obvious trace of Theodoret's work in PZ's, while Eusebius' may just be mentioned in order to justify the inclusion of the story of the baptism of Constantine by Silvester at i.7: PZ specifically notes (at i.1) that neither Socrates nor Eusebius provides this story. Socrates is thus clearly the most important of the three church historians for PZ, and it is not surprising that his name comes up again at ii.2, where his succinct account (*HE* vii.34) of the Council of Ephesus (431) is noted. Whether PZ used Socrates in Greek or Syriac is uncertain: a translation and an abridgement of the work existed in Syriac, and references to it are found in later sources, such as Jacob of Edessa, Michael the Syrian and Barhebraeus.³⁷

255, on this case; as he notes, 1996b, 187, 189, 199, PD has many other such lists of patriarchs earlier in his chronicle. See also Nau 1897, 530, van Ginkel 1995, 63, arguing for use of a common source. Van Ginkel 1998a, 500, argues in addition that the source should be dated to Anastasius' reign.

36 See AK xxxvi-vii, Gelzer 1883, 509–10. A significant element in Gelzer's case was the reference in PZ, Th. Lect. and Niceph. *Chr. Synt.* 131, to two patriarchs of Antioch called Stephen in the 470s, which he held to be mistaken. See, however, Blaudeau 2006a, 195 n.532, against this. It is true that some of the incidental remarks about certain patriarchs, e.g. Juvenal, are somewhat similar, but they are of such a banal nature that it is hard to read much into them.

37 See Witakowski 1996b, 182–4, Weltecke 2003, 43, Debié 2009b, 25, on the Syriac versions of Socrates and the sources that used them. It is worth noting that Barheb. *CE* 148/50 actually quotes Socrates *HE* vii.32 when assessing Nestorius, a section not derived from Mich. Syr. He also refers specifically just before this, 147/8, to PZ, from whom he ultimately derives (cf. Mich. Syr. viii.4 [172–3a/16], probably Barheb.'s source rather than PZ) the figure of 193 bishops who attended the council (PZ ii.2).

(v) **Written records of church councils**, what PZ (ii.0) calls *pepragmena* (acts) and *hypomnêmata* (memoranda).³⁸ He here refers to acts of the councils of Ephesus I (431), Ephesus II (449), as well as of the local council in Constantinople that examined and condemned Eutyches in 448: at ii.2–3 he refers to the acts quite specifically, even quoting small sections of them. His figures for the number of bishops or abbots attending these councils appear to derive from the proceedings themselves and are remarkably accurate. One example may suffice here: at ii.2 (124/86) he states that 31 bishops and 22 archimandrites summoned Eutyches to appear before them in Constantinople (in 448); the *Acts of Chalcedon*, on the other hand, gives 30 bishops and 23 archimandrites.³⁹

(vi) **Dossiers of correspondence**, sometimes cited *in extenso*, sometimes truncated, occasionally merely alluded to. The following instances may be noted:

- (a) **i.2–3**, an exchange of letters, in which the first correspondent seeks advice on how to resolve discrepancies between the calculation of generations in the Syriac version of Genesis and the Greek translation of the Septuagint; his addressee offers a full reply, including a corrected chronological table. We have already discussed this exchange in section (2) above.
- (b) **i.4–5**, an exchange of letters between someone – one might think, our author – and Moses of Ingilene, in which the first correspondent alludes to having read a Greek book from the library of the bishops of the family of Bet Brw' from the city of Resh'aina (Theodosiopolis). The writer proposes to send the book to Moses, in order that he translate it into Syriac and explain its significance. The work in question is the tale of Joseph and Aseneth (Asyath in PZ), which is then related following a lengthy reply from Moses. Moses of Ingilene's dates are uncertain, although most scholars place him in the mid-sixth century; it is possible therefore that PZ, writing in 568/9, could have been in contact with him. This exchange of letters may thus be contemporary or have been found by PZ and quoted *in extenso*.⁴⁰

38 On the former term see Blaudeau 2006a, 568 n.392; on the latter, Lampe 1961, 1451.

39 For more detail, see our commentary *ad loc.* in section F below. Cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.552 (ACO ii.1, pp.145–7). Millar 2006, 98, stresses the fact that a surviving manuscript of the Syriac translation of the Acts of Ephesus II dates to as early as 535, cf. *idem* 2009, 46–7, 56–7.

40 See Duval 1899, 367, Baumstark 1922, 160–1, Philonenko 1968, 13, on Moses. He edited a translation of a work of Cyril of Alexandria dedicated to a certain Paphnutius after the death of Philoxenus (in 523, cf. de Halleux 1963, 101) and his *chorepiskopos* Polycarp, and thus clearly belongs to the early to mid-sixth century. See further section F below. PZ's form Asyath no doubt results from a confusion between the nun and yod in Syriac, which look very similar.

- (c) **ii.4**, the letter of Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople (434–446) to the Armenians (*CPG* 5897), composed most probably in 435, which survives in Greek in an anti-Chalcedonian dossier (Schwartz 1927b). In a detailed study of the Syriac versions of this letter, which survives in several languages, Lukas van Rompay concluded that PZ most likely had at his disposal an already existing translation of the letter, which he then adapted for his purposes, excising both the opening and concluding sections, thereby removing all traces of its original context. PZ furthermore gave the whole document a more anti-Chalcedonian slant by omitting anything that hinted at a possible duality in Christ's nature; he also inserted references to Mary as the God-bearer which were not present in the original work.⁴¹
 - (d) **ix.10–13**, the exchange of letters between the patriarch Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus. PZ gives a translation from the Greek of the first two (out of three) letters exchanged between the two anti-Chalcedonian leaders that is independent of that of Paul of Callinicum.⁴² As in the case of (c), PZ justifies the inclusion of the material on the grounds that it is 'for the profit of those who were discerning and for those who are lovers of doctrine' (ix.9b).
 - (e) **ix.20–26**, the dossier of correspondence between the three anti-Chalcedonian patriarchs, Severus of Antioch, Theodosius of Alexandria and Anthimus of Constantinople. As we have noted in our commentary, this dossier was available in Greek in the 590s, when Evagrius was writing (cf. iv.11), although he merely summarises it. Some of the letters, moreover, were still available to be consulted in Rome in 680. Michael the Syrian had access to a more complete version than that preserved in our version of PZ, a point to which we shall return; he also presents the letters in a different, and indeed more logical, order.⁴³
 - (f) **x.4**, a letter from Rabbula to bishop Gemellinus of Perrhê, condemning priests who live off the bread and wine of the eucharist while pretending to be fasting. This letter was sufficiently popular to be included, in an abridged form, in PD's chronicle (ii, 11/12), albeit in a different context; Michael the Syrian also preserves it. Once again, PZ justifies the insertion 'lest anyone go astray in such an iniquity' (x.4a).⁴⁴
- (vii) **Self-standing accounts**, some of them in the form of letters, inserted into the narrative. Again, we may present an outline of the various instances.

41 See van Rompay 1985, esp. 432 on PZ's 'deliberate intervention' in the work and note also 443 n.67 on terminological differences between the rendering of certain Greek terms in Syriac here and elsewhere in his work. See further section F below.

42 See Allen and Hayward 2004, 31, on Paul's translation (completed before 528).

43 See PZ ix nn.311, 313. At ix.24e-f we translate a section lost from our version of PZ which appears to have been deliberately cut.

44 See PZ x n.41 for details with Witakowski 1991, 258, suggesting that PD (Joh. Eph. in this case) derived it from PZ. See also Horn and Phenix 2011.

- (a) The tale of Joseph and Aseneth (i.5), noted above. It is worth noting that PZ's version of this, one among many in different languages, is the earliest, although the work itself was composed in Greek.⁴⁵ The inclusion of this episode, set in the Old Testament world of the Pharaoh's court, may be a further indication of familiarity with Eusebius' chronicle, which dealt with this period, as also of PZ's wish to offer something more akin to universal history than merely a church history.⁴⁶
- (b) The baptism of Constantine by Silvester, otherwise known as the *Actus Silvestri* (i.7). Like the tale of Joseph and Aseneth, this story exists in many different languages and variants.⁴⁷ In this case, PZ's is certainly not the oldest, but he justifies its inclusion on the grounds that it had been omitted from the accounts of Eusebius and Socrates (i.1). Moreover, he adds (i.1j) that the story is to be found depicted in several places at Rome, as we know it was also in Constantinople.⁴⁸ It seems reasonable to infer that his source for this information was someone who had visited Rome and reported on what he had seen. As it happens, at i.9 PZ refers specifically to someone who had studied at Rome and contributed significantly to Syriac literature, Isaac (known as Isaac of Antioch, although born in Amida).⁴⁹ We should note further that PZ

45 Cf. Greatrex 2006, 49 n.26 for some references; also Inowlocki 2002, 22–6, Humphrey 2000, Burchard 1965, 91–9, 133 (noting that PZ's is the first attestation of the work, cf. Kraemer 1998, 225–6), Burchard 1996, 352–5. See Burchard 2003 for a Greek edition. An English tr. with extensive introduction may be found in Burchard 1985, cf. Brooks 1918.

46 So Witakowski, forthcoming.

47 See (e.g.) Amerise 2005, 104–10, on eastern versions of this legend generally, although she wrongly supposes that the account may have been part of Zach.'s, rather than PZ's, work, 119 for its diffusion; Greatrex 2006, 49 n.27, for further references to relevant secondary literature, among which we might single out Fowden 1994a and 1994b and Lieu 2006, 298–301. See also Witakowski 1987, 130–1, and idem 1999, 357–9, noting that PD's version (i, 151–4/113–15) is more like PZ's than Mich. Syr.'s (vii.1, 121–4c/241–3), and suggesting that PD's came through John of Ephesus or through an abbreviated version of the *Actus* itself. Mich. Syr., on the other hand, has Constantine's father being cured and converted, rather than the Emperor Constantine himself, cf. Amerise 2005, 109–10. See further section F below.

48 See Greatrex 2006, 49–50 n.27 and Lieu 2006, 300. Jan van Ginkel suggests to us that PZ may refer in fact to Constantinople, if he mistook a reference to 'New Rome' as indicating Rome itself rather than the eastern capital.

49 Several distinguished writers of this name in Syriac were known. Such was the confusion among them that John of Litarba wrote in the seventh century to Jacob of Edessa to seek clarification as to which was which. His reply is BL Add. 12172(b), fol.121^r, tr. in Wright 1871, 603, of which there is neither a full edition nor a translation, cf. van Ginkel 2008, 79, no.14, but note that the Syriac text is printed in Bedjan 1903, iv–v, in the footnote. In this reply Jacob reports the first Isaac (of Amida) as having been 'a disciple of Ephraem, who went to Rome in the reign of Arcadius to see the Capitol, and on his way back stopped some time at Byzantium, where he suffered imprisonment. After his return, he became a priest in the church of Amida'. Cf. Marc. com. a. 459 with Nau 1899, 592, Baumstark 1922, 63–6 and Croke 1995, 95.

addresses his sponsor directly at the opening of his account (i.7, 56–7/40): having noted that Eusebius, in the ten books of his *Ecclesiastical History*, covered the martyrdoms of Christians until his own day, as also the holders of the main bishoprics, he points out that he omitted just this one episode. He now proceeds to relate it, ‘As you, O our holy father, commanded me’ (i, 56/40) praying that he is not to be blamed for anything in the story and that he, rather than his dedicatee, will be held responsible for any errors.

- (c) The discovery of the relics of St Stephen and other saints in December 415 by the priest Lucian (i.8), of which versions in several other languages have survived, as well as another distinct Syriac version. This is inserted into the work with no introduction and follows the surviving Greek and Latin versions quite closely.⁵⁰
- (d) The story of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, another very popular legend in Late Antiquity (ii.1). Here again, as Ernest Honigmann demonstrated, PZ’s version is among the earliest, even if the original was in Greek. PZ situates the episode very precisely in A.D. 440, approximately 190 years, as he says, after the seven youths were immured during the persecution of Christians under Decius. Although PZ’s version of this legend is generally omitted in translations of his work, as indeed is the case here, it should not be perceived as distinct from the remaining, apparently more historical, sections of book ii. For PZ the events in question were as historical as the downfall of Eutyches, and, as with his accounts of the second Council of Ephesus, he drew on *hypomnēmata* to provide the relevant information. He even cross-checked the dates in his chronicle, as we have noted above, in order to situate the episode precisely. The legend moreover has a background in a little-known controversy of the 440s: following Origen, some had doubted the genuineness of Christ’s resurrection, but the revival of the Sleepers offered conclusive proof and relieved the Emperor Theodosius’ doubts.⁵¹

50 See *BHO* 1087a and b, *BHG* 1648x, Vanderlinden 1946, 178–80, for a summary of the story, Gordini 1968 for a useful overview. We have not included the dates in this work (given at 94/65 with great precision) in our earlier discussion, since they clearly belong to the work itself and not to PZ. The story might have come to PZ’s attention through his chronicle source (see above), since Marc. *com.* a.415.2 reports the finding of the relics and at a.439.2 describes the transfer of some of them to Constantinople through the empress Eudocia. Croke 2001, 204–5, describes how Marcellinus incorporated his longest entry, concerning the discovery of the head of John the Baptist, under a.453, and suggests that it is linked to a notice about the annual procession in Constantinople in his honour. See further section F below.

51 We rely here on the analysis of Honigmann 1953d, esp. 138–9, cf. Peeters 1923, 381–2. Honigmann suggests that the legend was created in 449/50 in order to boost the position of bishop Stephen of Ephesus, but that it was later reworked when he fell from favour. PD i, 195–206/145–54 (cf. 135–43/101–7, the first part), also relates the tale, but in a different version, in which there are eight, rather than seven, youths, cf. Witakowski 1996b, 200–2. PZ’s version, compared to the Greek (*PG* 115, 427–48), is more elaborate, offering the chronological

- (e) The letter of Simeon to his abbot Samuel concerning the downfall of Patriarch Macedonius in Constantinople in July-August 511 (**vii.8**); PZ specifies clearly that it is included 'for the edification of readers' (vii.7c).⁵²
- (f) The petition of the monks of the East and Cosmas of Qenneshrin (Chalcis) (**vii.11**), presented at the synod of Sidon in 511 or 512. Although he clearly had the full text at his disposal, PZ deliberately cut it short.⁵³
- (g) The letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham on the martyrs of Najran (**viii.3**), of which there are again numerous versions in Syriac.⁵⁴
- (h) Mara of Amida's prologue on Christ's life, followed by the episode of the woman caught in adultery (John 7.53–8.11, PZ **viii.7**). PZ justifies the inclusion of these two sections partly on the grounds of Mara's eminence, and partly because the episode in question is not to be found in the Syriac versions of John's gospel of the time.⁵⁵
- (i) The petition of the anti-Chalcedonian bishops to Justinian, for which PZ is the only source, which preceded the negotiations in Constantinople in early 532 (**ix.15**). PZ again does not hesitate to abridge the work, explicitly stating that he omits various arguments 'because of their length and because they can be found everywhere in documents [written] against Dyophysitism' (ix.15h).⁵⁶
- (j) A description of Rome and its buildings (**x.16**), clearly derived from a version of the *Breviarium* otherwise attested in Latin. Isaac of Antioch/Amida could well have brought such a document back from Rome; it certainly does not reflect the situation of the mid-sixth century but probably goes back rather to the fourth.⁵⁷
- (k) A geographical survey of the world, from Spain to the Far East, derived (probably indirectly) from Ptolemy's *Geography* (**xii.7a-i**) followed by a description of the Caucasus region, and then an account of more recent events there, based on oral sources (**xii.7.j-q**). There is no parallel for either of these sections, nor are they quoted by subsequent Syriac authors. Although Jacob of Edessa in his *Hexaameron* refers to Ptolemy and makes use of his work, there does not appear to be any link to PZ.⁵⁸ The author of this section, like

calculations noted above, p.40, as well as citing Origen, Methodius, Eustathius and Epiphanius of Salamis, cf. Honigmann, *art. cit.*, 145–6.

52 See PZ vii n.135 on the letter; more generally Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009 on correspondence surrounding these events.

53 Cf. PZ vii n.201. It is worth noting that Cosmas is mentioned already at iv.6d as an author of worthy works, presumably because PZ had a copy of them at his disposal.

54 See PZ viii n.20 for a detailed consideration of PZ's version.

55 Cf. PZ ix.0b, *ad finem*, although the passage of course comes in viii.

56 See PZ ix n.188 on this document.

57 See PZ x n.149.

58 See PZ xii n.27 for a detailed analysis of the first section with Witakowski 2007, 235.

the pessimistic source noted below (x), appears to have been convinced of the imminent end of the world (xii.7o), but, unlike the pessimist, he drew his conclusion from the remarkable conversions being made, reaching out to the Caucasus and even to the Persian court. Whereas the pessimist highlights the disasters that occurred in Justinian's reign, this author claims that 'peace has reigned among the nations' (xii.7j). He has oral sources for his information on the Christianisation of the Caucasus (xii.7l), whom he clearly knew personally, and he indicates that he was writing in 554/5 (xii.7j).

We have deliberately omitted from this list the letter of Dioscorus (**iii.1g-h**) and the address of Marcian to the council of Chalcedon (**iii.1, section 'I'**); letters of Timothy Aelurus quoted *in extenso* in PZ **iv.6** (the letter to the Emperor Leo, cut short at the end), and **iv.12** (two further letters, incorporating a large number of quotations from the church fathers), as well as that of Anatolius (**iv.8**), drastically curtailed; the *Encyclicon* of Basiliscus (**v.2**), the petition of the bishops assembled at Ephesus soon afterwards (**v.3**), the address (*prosphônêsis*) of Martyrius of Jerusalem (**v.6b-d**, clearly abbreviated), the *Henoticon* of Zeno (**v.8**), and the series of letters to Peter of Alexandria from his counterparts Peter the Fuller, Acacius, and Martyrius (**v.10-12**); the letter of Patriarch Fravitta of Constantinople to Peter of Alexandria (**vi.5**), and Peter's reply (**vi.6**). All of these of course formed part of Zachariah's work, although PZ evidently felt entitled to omit sections that he found irrelevant; as we have noted elsewhere (B [3][iv]), it is clear from Evagrius' work that other sections were excised entirely.⁵⁹

It should be immediately apparent that these quotations, many of them lengthy, comprise a significant proportion of PZ's work. The vast majority relate to church affairs, and in this tendency to quote at length relevant documents PZ follows in the tradition of Eusebius and Socrates, both of whom did likewise; so too did Evagrius in the 590s.⁶⁰ His aim in all cases, as he repeatedly insists, is the edification of his reader, as he mentions specifically at ii.5 (on the tome of Proclus), as at iv.6d, vi.7b, vii.7c, ix.0b (on Mara's letter), ix.9b, cf. ix.13f; this emerges clearly also from his preface at

On the second see n.196, where we note Czeglédý's suggestion that it was derived from both Greek and Persian sources. Although Nöldeke 1871, 3, rightly drew attention to the importance of PZ's version of Ptolemy's *Geography*, Stückelberger and Grasshof 2006, the most recent edition of this work, fail to make the slightest reference to it, but see Gautier Dalché 2009, 50–4, for some useful remarks.

⁵⁹ Cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 522 n.147, for a list of documents in Zachariah's work.

⁶⁰ Cf. (e.g.) Euseb. *HE* ii.25, iii.28, Thdrt. *HE* i.4, ii.16, Socr. *HE* iv.12, Evagr. iii.17, 31. Note that Evagrius includes an extensive summary of parts of Proc.'s *Wars* (e.g. at iv.12–28) that is rather less relevant to church history.

ii.0.⁶¹ It is difficult to ascertain his sources for these documents, especially where he is either the first or the only Syriac source to report them. We have already noted that Isaac of Antioch/Amida may have supplied him with material relating to Rome. As regards ecclesiastical correspondence, it is clear from a glance at Wright's catalogue of Syriac manuscripts in the British Museum (now Library) that extensive collections of letters of the church fathers circulated. Of particular interest in the context of PZ is BL Add. 12,156, which is dated to AG 873 (A.D. 562), which contains an extensive selection of Timothy Aelurus' letters and treatises (overlapping with PZ iv), extracts from the second Council of Ephesus, Proclus' letter to the Armenians (PZ ii.5), and citations from the church fathers, notably Cyril of Alexandria.⁶² BL Add. 12,155, an eighth-century manuscript, also illustrates the sort of collection on which PZ could have drawn – in an earlier version, of course. This manuscript comprises a large number of demonstrations from the church fathers against Chalcedon and (e.g.) followers of Julian of Halicarnassus, including quotations from Basiliscus' *Encyclicon*, extracts from Socrates' and Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical Histories*, as also from the defence of the orthodox bishops sent to Justinian (which PZ ix.15 gives at greater length). It also quotes the correspondence between Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus in an effort to counteract the Julianists (cf. PZ ix.10–13).⁶³

The existence of such repositories of correspondence and relevant documents serves to explain several aspects of PZ's work. First, his ability to find this material and to insert it at an appropriate place – although in some cases, as with the letter of Rabbula or Mara's prologue, the logic of the positioning of the citation is sometimes obscure. Second, his readiness to truncate documents, limiting himself sometimes to just a few paragraphs. He makes this point most forcefully at iv.6d, where he intrudes into a letter of Timothy Aelurus quoted by Zachariah:

Since they [i.e. Timothy's arguments] are stated at length with quotations refuting them [i.e. the Chalcedonians], we shall not mention them here, so as not

61 Riad 1988, 104, points out, quite correctly, that this concern for the reader's edification is rather a stock theme in Syriac prefaces. Cf. Thdrt. *HE* i.1 with the remarks of A. Martin in the first vol. of the *SC* ed. and tr., 39–55, esp. 39, and Greatrex 2006, 44, noting similarities between Theodoret's and PZ's preface (i.1).

62 See Wright 1871, 640–8, for a summary of its contents. It is also discussed by Ebied and Wickham 1970, 1985 (in connection with Timothy's works). See too Millar 2009, 52–4, for a useful discussion of early Syriac manuscripts.

63 See Wright 1871, 921–55.

to bore the reader, since the faithful may find in every place refutations against them by [those who are] discerning, first of all by Dioscorus, and after him by this Timothy, and after him by Peter and by Philoxenus of Mabbug and by the eloquent Severus, chief of the bishops of Antioch, in his *Against the Grammarian*, and by Cosmas and Simeon of Legina, and in the letter of the Alexandrians.

In similar fashion, at ix.13f, PZ refers the reader to further works of Severus refuting Julian of Halicarnassus' views, implicitly justifying his decision not to quote any further correspondence between the two men. As he openly admits at ii.0, PZ was concerned lest his readers grow bored with his account. For this reason he explicitly summarises very succinctly the first Council of Ephesus (431), the proceedings of the trial of Eutyches in 448, the second ('Robber') council of Ephesus (449) and the Council of Chalcedon at ii.2–3, noting that while Socrates offered a brief account of the first council of Ephesus, the acts themselves covered the events 'at length' (PZV, i, 123/85).⁶⁴ At ii.5 he expresses his desire to render Zachariah's account 'briefly as far as possible' (PZV, i, 143/99), while noting somewhat critically at vi.7b, where his summarising of Zachariah draws to a close, that his predecessor wrote 'in expansive speech, as is typical of the broad style of the Greeks'. One can thus account for the rather abrupt excisions in PZ's work, not to mention its omissions, by appreciating the degree to which documents, particularly those relating to theological disputes, circulated at the time and were readily available 'to the discerning', as PZ would call them.⁶⁵

Lastly, the existence of such documents serves to explain not only what was omitted or abridged, but also what was included. For, as we have seen, PZ's version is frequently the only Syriac version of a particular episode or document, e.g. in the case of Joseph and Aseneth or the baptism of Constantine by Silvester or the description of the city of Rome. We would suggest that his choice was guided not only by consideration of the edification of his readers, discussed above, but also by what he could offer that was new or unique. The baptism of Constantine fitted both goals admirably: it was not to be found in earlier sources, as he notes, and of course was an edifying tale of the overcoming of paganism. Less immediately edifying sections,

⁶⁴ Socrates of course covered only the first of these events (*HE* vii.34).

⁶⁵ Cf. Allen 1980, 484–5, noting that the omission of documents in order not to bore the readers is something of a *topos* in *Ecclesiastical Histories*, and some of them at least could go back to Zach. rather than being PZ's own excisions, cf. Evagr. ii.10 (justifying his omission of the letters replying to Leo's *Codex Encyclicus*). See also Rist 2002, 98, on the availability of documents elsewhere.

such as the description of Rome or the legend of Joseph and Aseneth, were included, we suggest, because of their sheer novelty: PZ had come across them in his researches and determined to transmit them to posterity, thereby entertaining his readers with accounts they had never before come across as well as manifesting his own erudition in having brought them to light. This technique may be found also in Procopius of Caesarea, whose introduction to the *Persian Wars* – and indeed to a lesser extent to the *Vandalic* and *Gothic Wars* – makes no attempt to cover events systematically up to his own day. Rather, he displays his erudition by an elaborate comparison between Homeric and contemporary bowmen (i.1.6–16), then entertains his readers with remarkable tales of the Persian kings and their tribulations, leading up to the Persian war of Anastasius at the start of the sixth century and negotiations surrounding the possible adoption of Khusro by Justin I (i.2–10). Most of what he recounts is not to be found in other sources; on the other hand, some important events are passed over entirely. Both PZ and Procopius, we thus suggest, saw fit to include in their works remarkable stories that they knew were rare items, both in order to entertain and to show the depth of their researches.⁶⁶

(viii) **An account of the reign of the Emperor Anastasius**, focused on the city of Amida (vii.1–15, but probably excluding vii.8 and vii.11, on which see above). The author of this section was acquainted with the Gadana who betrayed the Persian garrison at Amida to the Romans (vii.5b).⁶⁷ The account becomes remarkably thin from 512 onwards, especially for church affairs: one might have expected some detail on Severus' tenure as patriarch of Antioch, even if our author was based in Amida.⁶⁸ Despite the detail in this section about (e.g.) the siege of Amida, there are few dates offered, and those that we do find are generally for items probably derived from

66 See Greatrex 1994, 82, on the opening chapters of Proc., cf. Treadgold 2007, 192–3. Kaldellis 2004, 62–93, offers a completely different interpretation, arguing for a moral purpose in the narrative of Persian history, which we find somewhat conjectural, cf. Whitby 2005, 649.

67 If, as we shall suggest, this 'I' is not PZ, it is nonetheless unsurprising that he has left it in his work: one might compare PD ii, 77/72, referring to 'our humble self, that is John of Asia', left in PD's chronicle from a part of John of Ephesus' *HE*, cf. Witakowski 1987, 132.

68 It appears that the (anti-Chalcedonian) church historian John Diakrinomenos' work drew to a close in 512 with the accession of Severus, cf. Photius, *Bibl.* cod.41 and the few fragments gathered at the end of Hansen's edition of Th. Lect. with Treadgold 2007, 168–9. Since so little is known of John, it would be foolish to seek to connect him with the author of PZ vii. It is worth noting, however, that there are links in vii to later books, e.g. at vii.6g, looking forward to events in viii and later.

the chronicle (on which see above), e.g. at vii.1a (death of Zeno, accession of Anastasius, AG and indiction date), vii.2a (natural disasters, dates in indiction years), vii.10 (several dating systems used to date the synod of Sidon, cf. vii.11, available in the document cited), then the death of Ariadne, vii.13a (AG date) and vii.14a (indiction date for the succession of John as patriarch of Constantinople, probably from the chronicle). We have insisted on this point because we wish to argue that book vii is distinct from viii-x, a distinction which we did not appreciate at the time of our study published in 2006 and which has not been proposed elsewhere. As we shall see in the next section, the author of viii-x peppered his account with indiction dates, especially in book ix. One final argument in favour of a distinct author for book vii is the fact that this book alone is cited by the thirteenth-century author of the *Chr. 1234*, who offers a detailed account of the siege of Amida, drawn entirely from PZ, as well as an account of how hostilities with Persia began (from PZ vii.2) and an abridged version of the founding of Dara. When he comes on to deal with the reign of Justin, he places his accession in AG 832, whereas PZ puts it in 829. There are no further traces of PZ's work in the chronicle.⁶⁹

It is worth noting in this context that the accounts of Procopius and Pseudo-Zachariah concerning the siege of Amida display considerable similarities, as scholars have long noted. Whether Procopius and the author of PZ vii derived their material from a common source, or whether the former actually had access to the latter, is impossible to determine.⁷⁰

(ix) **A Justinianic source, covering books viii-x.** The author of these books wrote during the reign of Justinian, who is on more than one occasion referred to as the reigning emperor, e.g. at viii.5c, ix.1a ('from the start of his reign until today'), x.0a ('during the reign of the present serene Emperor Justinian'). This author was acquainted with the hermit Dodo (viii.5a) and the Italian Dominic, who fled from Theoderic's Italy to Constantinople (ix.18a). He makes regular use of indictional dating and provides a detailed account of both secular and ecclesiastical affairs for the reigns of the two emperors, at any rate up until the late 540s.

69 *Chr. 1234*, chs.47–52, ch.53 for the accession of Justin (183–91/144–50). The ecclesiastical part of this work does not survive for the period covered by PZ. On the work itself see Witakowski 1987, 85.

70 PZ vii.3–4 and Proc. *Wars* i.7–9, esp. i.7.12–33, 9.1–19. On the issue of Proc.'s sources see Greatrex 1998, 73–4, cf. Debié 2003, 612, 615 (suggesting a common Persian source) and now Greatrex, forthcoming. Note also van Ginkel 1995, 62, arguing for use of a common source by Joh. Eph. and PZ concerning the reign of Anastasius, resulting in several similar entries.

Further precision is difficult to attain on these books. Book viii is rather short and shows little sign of any Amidene bias, unlike vii or ix; in the following book, by contrast, we hear much about events at Martyropolis, near Amida, as well as about the conflict in Mesopotamia. Muriel Debié has detected traces of Malalas 17.1–2 in the first two chapters, which deal in considerable detail with events in Constantinople between 518 and 520 and in some places, as in his description of Marinus' murals at some baths in the imperial capital (viii.1a), there are no parallels.⁷¹ Given that, unlike PD's chronicle, derived from John of Ephesus, PZ nowhere else appears to draw on Malalas, it is hard to know what to make of this one section; in this case PD did not draw on Malalas, via John, for his information. This same author may well also have written xii.6, which deals with local events near Amida in 553 and uses the indictional dating system. Whether he also contributed book xi is impossible to say, since its contents are unknown.

(x) **An apocalyptic source** that expected an imminent end of the world and found numerous sinister signs that foreshadowed it, such as a shower of ash from the sky (xii.4–5). This author preferred to date events by regnal years and even also includes a dating from Christ's birth.⁷² His synchronisations are a little awry, but it appears that he was writing in A.D. 559/60 (xii.4b); in the following chapter, on the other hand, he returns to the 28th year of Justinian's reign, i.e. 556. From the reference to Amida as 'here' at xii.4c one may infer that this author was a native of this city. Although fears of the end of the world were particularly high during the reign of Anastasius, when the six thousandth year since Creation was due to occur, the moment at which it was thought that it would come to an end, they did not dissipate when this moment passed; moreover, there were a number of ways of calculating when the six thousandth year would occur, and the author of i.3 calculates that the year 559/60 was the equivalent of the year 5908 since creation. Hence, as Mischa Meier has brought out, these fears continued to be felt, gaining some momentum with the spread of the plague (cf. PZ xii.5a) and other odd phenomena. Both John of Ephesus and this section of

71 Debié 2004a, 157, 162–3, for her arguments, cf. also Greatrex 2007a, 99–105, on Malalas and PZ on this period.

72 On dating from Christ's birth, a system pioneered by the sixth-century monk Dionysius Exiguus, see Meier 2002, 171–2, arguing that it arose in a context of great uncertainty about time-reckoning generally, cf. Greatrex 2006, 50 n.32. On regnal dates, see Dölger 1949 and Meier 2002, 173; Justinian's *Novel* 47 of 537 laid down that all official documents should be dated by regnal year (among other indicators).

PZ reflect this tendency, a gloomy interpretation of current events according to which the sequence of ‘earthquakes, famines, wars in various places, the abundance of iniquity’ (PZ xii.5a) and other factors had combined to bring about the destruction of the world. One might associate this source with Joseph or the other unknown writers alluded to by PZ (or, more precisely, the author of a letter inserted there) at the end of i.3 (i, 17/12), which refers to Joseph and two or three other commentators for whom the seventh age is beginning ‘during which the sun became dark, the earth shook and, a little later, a plague occurred.’⁷³

(4) The transmission of PZ

It is worth briefly examining the transmission of the work of PZ to the later Syriac tradition. As we have noted above, *Chr. 1234* uses only book vii, displaying no sign of knowledge of any other part of the work; it need not detain us further. Jacob of Edessa in the seventh century also drew on PZ, at least if the Armenian version of the preface of Michael the Syrian can be trusted on this.⁷⁴ The seventh-century ‘Melkite chronicle’ also drew on PZ, as too probably did the ninth-century *Chr. 846*.⁷⁵ The principal quarrier of PZ’s work was, however, Michael the Syrian, who excerpted large sections of it for his chronicle, on several occasions signalling his dependence on it (e.g. at viii.4 [172–6b/17–21] on the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, said to be from the first chapter of PZ, or at ix.28 [307–8c/240], on the Justinianic plague).⁷⁶

73 See van Ginkel 2007, 207–11, on John and PZ’s millenarian tendencies, Meier 2003a, 345–426 on such views in the sixth century; cf. Whitby 2003, 479, on John. See also Ashbrook Harvey 1988, 298–302, noting similarly bleak passages in Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, but arguing that this tendency waned over the sixth century, cf. Witakowski 1990b. Witakowski 1987, 70–1 and Meier, *op. cit.*, 443–65 discuss the whole issue of the 6000 years of creation and how to calculate them, cf. Meier 2002, 154–7; for the Greek chronicler Malalas, for instance, the 6000th year had passed already in the fifth century. On the calculations at PZ i.3, see n.14 above. We have emended the Syriac in PZT from *ndt* here to *za‘at*, meaning ‘shake or tremble’.

74 In Chabot’s translation, vol.1, 2. See Witakowski 2008, 42 on this. Rist 2002, 92–3, offers a useful overview of later sources’ use of PZ.

75 Allen 1980, 473 n.4 offers a detailed list of parallels on both sources. On the Melkite chronicle see also de Halleux 1978, 7 and n.23. In the case of *Chr. 846* one may note the similar account of the Council of Ephesus II (449), 125–6/87 (cf. PZ ii.3), and of succeeding events; cf. 222/169 and PZ viii.1b.

76 See Chabot’s introduction, vol.1, xxviii–xxxi. Other instances where Mich. Syr. cites PZ by name may be found at viii.10 (185a/37) and viii.12 (215a/88), cf. AK xlv for a rather limited list of cases where Mich. Syr. drew on PZ (seven noted).

Michael can therefore be of use in correcting readings in PZ's text, and on other occasions for supplementing gaps in the manuscript, e.g. in book x of PZ. There is a problem, however, in reconstructing PZ on the basis of Michael the Syrian. There are a handful of occasions on which it seems as though Michael had access to a fuller version of PZ than the one to which we today have access, even though our principal manuscript dates to as early as 600. It is worth noting the occasions briefly. First, at iv.7a PZ, here following Zachariah of Mytilene, refers to Amphilochius of Side's resistance to the Council of Chalcedon, describing a letter he wrote to Patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople against it, 'with copious demonstrations and arguments from Scripture and the fathers.' But he gives no quotations from it, whereas Michael (ix.5 [251–3c/144–8]) provides a collection of excerpts.⁷⁷ Second, in a section clearly derived from PZ vii.8f–g, Michael explains that Anastasius knew his troops were ripe for revolt in 511 because the patriarch Macedonius was in contact with his nephew Vitalian.⁷⁸ Third, in a section derived from PZ viii.5a, Michael (ix.16 [270–1a/178]) has an important extra phrase about the raid of Mundhir on Roman territory during Justin's reign, specifying the region where he conducted his raid.⁷⁹ Lastly, he gives the full text of a letter from patriarch Theodosius to Severus, which we have included at ix.24e–f (from Mich. Syr. ix.25 [293–4/216–17, left column]), although PZ excised this concluding section of the letter.⁸⁰

Four such instances cannot be ascribed to chance or scribal error. We prefer to suppose that Michael had access to a fuller version of PZ's work, at least for the relevant sections; given that neither he, nor indeed any other later source, cites PZ's book xii, it is possible that his version lacked this

77 Cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 540, 564 n.371 on elements from Zach. (as opposed to PZ) in Mich. Syr., cf. 585 n.22. See section (3)(i) above. On the case of Amphilochius see Allen 1980, 476 n.1, section B (3)(iv) above.

78 Mich. Syr. ix.9 (262c/164) with our n.149 *ad loc.* and Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 238 n.51. Although Mich. Syr. is abbreviating the letter of Simeon in PZ, the information on either side of this statement comes from him. It seems likely therefore that, as in the next instance, Mich. Syr. had a slightly fuller version of PZ at his disposal.

79 We have included this phrase in our translation, placing it in italics as we generally do for indirectly attested passages from PZ. Van Ginkel 1998b, cf. *idem* 2006, rightly warns against reconstructing earlier works on the basis of Mich. Syr.'s text, arguing that Michael did not hesitate to rearrange and adapt his material.

80 There might, of course, be other cases unknown to us, since we cannot be sure what exactly Mich. Syr. took from his version of PZ. For another interesting case of apparent use of PZ by a Syriac source, which in turn influenced both Theophanes and Mich. Syr., see Greatrex 2009, 40–2.

section, on the other hand.⁸¹ If we follow this reasoning, we must conclude that PZ's work circulated in different versions, one of which has come down to us, and another – admittedly very similar, but somewhat fuller – was used by Michael. These alterations must have occurred in the thirty or so years between the composition of the work and the preparation of our chief manuscript. There is nothing implausible in this, since chronicles – and, no doubt, compilations of miscellaneous history – tended to evolve as soon as they were set down, with subsequent compilers (or scribes) making adjustments to suit their interests, just as PZ himself had done with the translation of Zachariah (or indeed the work itself, if he drew directly on it).⁸² Of course, there is one other possibility, which in our view is less probable than the one we have advocated. Michael might have derived his extra information from other dossiers at his disposal, e.g. of the correspondence of Severus. In the case of a well-known patriarch like Severus, this is certainly feasible, but in the other three cases such an explanation seems more far-fetched. We summarise graphically the uncertain relationship between our version of PZ and Michael the Syrian in Diagram 1. The dotted lines indicate possible avenues of transmission for PZ's information to the later chronicler: Michael may have derived at least some data from fuller versions of PZ's sources (such as the church historian Zachariah of Mytilene); on the other hand, he may equally have had access to a fuller version of PZ's compilation than that which is preserved in our chief surviving manuscript of c. A.D. 600. It is worth bearing in mind, moreover, that these various possibilities are not incompatible with one another.

We should briefly mention the somewhat later Syriac chronicler, Barhebraeus, and in particular his *Chronicon ecclesiasticum*. He too specifically invokes PZ's work, although it is sometimes supposed that he did no more than derive his material from Michael the Syrian rather than directly from PZ.⁸³ On one occasion that we have noticed, however, Barhebraeus supplies

81 One might equally argue that this book was of less interest, being essentially composed of millenarian accounts and obscure geographical information. Yet while the former might have been of less relevance to Michael, the latter clearly interested him, as can be seen from his inclusion of the description of the city of Rome twice: see our notes at PZ x.16.

82 Cf. Greatrex 2007a, 106–10. A more elaborate diagram of PZ and his transmission is given in Greatrex 2009, 41, incorporating Evagrius.

83 So Weltecke 2003, 211, although cf. the more cautious approach of Witakowski 1987, 86, idem 1990, 307 n.113, 'the possibility cannot be excluded that Bar Hebraeus made some independent use of the sources he quotes.' AK xlv identified eleven cases where Barhebraeus derived his material from PZ (three from his chronicle), more than they found for Michael the Syrian.




Diagram 1

additional information in a section that is otherwise taken from PZ, and it seems to us therefore that he may have had access to a fuller version of the work – whether the same as that of Michael, from which he occasionally chose to excerpt a little more, or a further copy, we cannot be sure. Thus, in dealing with the council of Chalcedon he supplies the name of the emissary sent to exert pressure on the patriarch Dioscorus (reported by PZ at iii.1f, cf. Barheb. *CE* 176/7). We are here on less firm ground than with Michael the Syrian, but it is worthwhile at any rate to countenance the possibility that Barhebraeus too had a slightly more detailed version of PZ than ours.

(5) PZ's literary style and interests (R.P., C.H.)

The general consensus on PZ is that there are two distinct sections. Books iii-vi reflect the authentic work of Zachariah Rhetor, while vii-xii are a continuation of events to the reign of Justinian. The central question that a study of the style of the whole work should address is whether one can discern a difference between these two sections. Now it is well known that both sections have been reworked, and so neither is homogeneous. This fact constitutes the first of the many problems in assessing the style of PZ. There is the second problem that PZ is, at least for the most part, a translation into Syriac. This has several facets. First, the manner of translation is inconsistent in terms of the approach between the poles of literal translation and

paraphrase and it is almost impossible to determine whether the paraphrase is the work of the original Greek authors and redactors, or of the translator. Then there is the possibility that the present work is the result of a harmony of multiple translations: a good number of the constituent elements of PZ, noted above (e.g. section [3][iv], [v], [vii][b], [h]), were not to be found in Syriac, and so it may have been necessary for our author to translate some and then edit other already extant translations. Hence it is not possible to provide a complete assessment of the language, translation technique, content, and rhetorical approach of this work. For this introduction, it should be sufficient to state whether there is an answer to the central question posed above.

One criterion that does separate the two sections concerns content. Both sections relate the history of doctrinal disputes and events concerning important figures in the church connected with these disputes. The second section is more concerned with secular, especially military, history, centred on events in northern Mesopotamia, the region that the author refers to as Bet Nahrain ‘the region of the two rivers,’ or the ‘Arab (Bet ‘Arbaye), ‘the territory of the Arabs.’⁸⁴ Book x describes the architectural wonders of Rome, and Book xii incorporates a Syriac version of the iterative section of Ptolemy’s *Geography*. It is possible that the same hand (or one of the hands) that attached Books x and xii to Books vii-xii also inserted the narratives concerning the wars with the Persians, but there is no clear evidence from the style or vocabulary of these passages that could confirm such a conclusion.

With respect to the manner in which events are narrated, both sections employ much the same devices. Setting aside the translations of letters and doctrinal tracts, the narratives employ citations from the Bible with roughly the same frequency in order to illustrate some aspect of the significance of the events the author narrates. With respect to vocabulary, again omitting sections that are part of identified works by Greek authors, the use of synonyms for various terms, such as ‘bishop’ (sometimes *episqopa*, sometimes *kahana*, lit. ‘priest’) are more or less evenly distributed across the two sections. The impression from the study of the grammar is that Syriac translation technique, at least as applied to passages which are not from the Bible, was relatively uniform across the period in which the present work was translated. One exception is that in some instances there is clear evidence for the substitution of a Peshitta reading for the Septuagint. These

84 See PZ vii n.22 for both terms.

instances have been mentioned in the footnotes. This is not unexpected, and moreover does not prove anything in terms of the translation technique and stylistic approach of the authors of iii-vi and vii-xii. All of this is not to say that further research in the future will not uncover some differences that will provide evidence for discerning two or more distinct translators.

(6) The manuscript basis of PZ, editions, translations and research to date (W.W., revised G.G.)

The work has been known to western scholars since the beginning of the eighteenth century. It was described by Joseph Simon Assemani in his invaluable *Bibliotheca Orientalis*.⁸⁵ There he presented an author called by him Zachariah, bishop of Melitene (in Armenia), fragments of whose work he had found preserved in a Vatican manuscript (Syr. 145 of perhaps the ninth century).⁸⁶ Over a century later, in 1838, these fragments were published by Cardinal Angelo Mai.⁸⁷ Three decades later a new and more comprehensive manuscript of the work was discovered in the British Museum by the Dutch scholar J.P.N. Land. This belonged to the collection which, just twenty years before his arrival in London (1857),⁸⁸ was acquired from the monastery Dayr al-Suryani in Wadi Natrun in Egypt. Land published the text in 1870⁸⁹ on the basis of this manuscript, i.e. Add. 17,202 ('A') which dates from about A.D. 600, having been written only three decades after PZ had completed his composition.

Add. 17,202 contains almost the entire work, except for several folios which are missing at the end, with the result that out of the twelve books into which the *Miscellaneous History* is divided, book 11 is totally lost and books 10 and 12 partially lost. There are relatively short fragments of our text preserved in three further manuscripts of the British Library collec-

⁸⁵ Assemani 1721, 54–62.

⁸⁶ MS Vat. Syr. 145 ('V'), containing a selection of 'useful' chapters of ecclesiastical histories (translated from Greek) of Socrates (fol. 22–65), Theodoret (fol. 65–78), and Zacharias 'Melitensis' (fol. 78–101). See Assemani and Assemani 1759, 259–63, Kugener 1900b, 204, Rist 2002, 81, Blaudeau 2006a, 544–5, Debié 2009b, 25–6.

⁸⁷ Mai 1838, 332–360, tr. 361–388, *Zachariae Rhetoris episcopi melitinensis Historiae ecclesiasticae capita selecta*, translated by two Maronites, Matthew Sciuhan (i.e. Shuhan) and Francis Mehaseb. The excerpts contain the following chapters of PZ's work: iii.1 (heavily edited), iii.2–7; vii.1 (first half), vii.3–6, 9, 13 (beginning); viii.3, 7; ix.6b–7, 12 (fragm.), 13 (large fragm.). See also Rist 2002, 81.

⁸⁸ Janson and van Rompay 1989, 47.

⁸⁹ Land 1870, reviewed by Nöldeke 1871.

tion (Add. 12,154, from c.800 ['C'], Add. 14,620 from the ninth century, and Add. 7190 from the twelfth century); these, however, do not help in restoring the lacunae in Add. 17,202.

Two years after Land's publication, the manuscript was described in detail by William Wright in his *Catalogue*.⁹⁰ Land's edition of the Syriac text was not followed by any translation,⁹¹ and thus the development of research on the work was slow⁹² until 1899 when two translations appeared simultaneously, one into German, by K. Ahrens and G. Krüger,⁹³ and the other into English, by E.W. Brooks and F.J. Hamilton.⁹⁴ Neither of the translations was complete, both omitting book I and a large part of book II, on the grounds that the material contained there was already known from elsewhere.⁹⁵ Furthermore, the omitted sections recounted, as we have seen, episodes of a legendary character regarded as unworthy of translation. These translations were followed by numerous reviews (eleven for the German⁹⁶ and seven for the English⁹⁷) and critical review articles, among which those by F. Delmas and M.-A. Kugener may be singled out.⁹⁸ A critical edition, which appears to be final, at least until new less incomplete manuscripts appear, was published in the CSCO series in 1919–24 by the same E.W. Brooks, with a translation, this time in full, into Latin.⁹⁹ Although again followed by a few reviews,¹⁰⁰ the edition did not give rise to any further

90 Wright 1872, 1046–61, who notes, 1046, that some leaves are lacking, especially at the end of the work, thus leading to the lacunae mentioned above (in books x–xii).

91 A translation into Dutch was made by Land's student W.J. van Douwen some time before 1886, but was never published. It was used, however, by Ahrens and Krüger for their German translation of the work, cf. Janson and van Rompay, 53–4.

92 Only one paper is known to the present writer (W.W.), Nau 1897, who tried here to correct (wrongly) Land's assertion that Zachariah wrote after 519.

93 Ahrens and Krüger 1899 (which we usually abbreviate to AK), which contains some notes by G. Hoffmann, M. Gelzer and T. Nöldeke.

94 Hamilton and Brooks 1899 (which we usually abbreviate to HB).

95 AK added their partial translation of PZ i–ii at the last minute, which accounts for the odd pagination system, AK vi, cf. Nöldeke 1899, 1363. They nonetheless omitted i.6–8, ii.1, cf. Rist 2002, 83.

96 Nau 1899, idem 1900a, Duval, 1900, Petit 1900, Krüger 1901, Anonymous 1900, Brooks 1900, Réville 1900, Jüllicher 1899, Nöldeke 1899, Jackson 1900.

97 Duval 1900, Cook 1901, Hilgenfeld 1904, Nau 1900b, idem 1900a, Krüger 1901, Anonymous 1900. See also the remarks of Rist 2002, 83–4, on both translations.

98 Delmas 1899–1900, Kugener 1900b. The latter author devoted another paper to a Greek expression in PZ's *Ecclesiastical History*, idem 1900c.

99 We refer to the text as PZT and the translation as PZV (versio). There are two volumes of each.

100 Allgeier 1923, Draguet 1927.

studies on the work. It has subsequently often been used as a source by historians, especially church historians, but few if any have been interested in it for its own sake, i.e. as a specimen of Syriac historiographical literature.

In addition to these publications, other studies have appeared in which our work was involved, but these have been mainly concerned with the Greek historian Zachariah the Rhetor and his identity, which we discussed in the last chapter. The connection between him and PZ is clear: the pseudonym of the Syriac historian is based on the name of the church historian who wrote in Greek, and parts of the latter's work are preserved in that of the former, as we have noted above. On the other hand, PZ's work is dealt with briefly in general monographs on the history of Syriac literature, i.e. those by William Wright, Rubens Duval, Anton Baumstark, Jean-Baptiste Chabot and Ignacio Ortiz de Urbina, and in works on Syriac historiography by Felix Haase, Sebastian Brock, D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, and Peter Nagel.¹⁰¹

In recent years, the trend has continued for Zachariah to attract more attention than PZ, as a glance at the studies used in the previous chapter indicates; Philippe Blaudeau's chapter on Zachariah in his 2006 monograph is of particular importance. We should also mention Pauline Allen's important study of 1980, which concerns the nature of Zachariah's work and the extent to which it is preserved in PZ; we have discussed this issue at the end of the last chapter.¹⁰² Yet PZ has not been altogether neglected: Josef Rist has published articles dealing with both Zachariah and with PZ and continues to work on both. This translation project has yielded a general article on PZ, published in 2006, and is generating several other papers, and in the near future a whole study of Syriac historiography, with much on PZ, will be published by Muriel Debié.¹⁰³

101 Wright 1894, 107–8, Duval 1907, 184–8, Baumstark 1922, 295, Chabot 1934, 76, Ortiz de Urbina 1965, 247, Haase 1925, 15, Brock 1979–80, 4–5, Wallace-Hadrill 1982, 54, 58, Nagel 1990, 255. The last author calls PZ's compilation a universal chronicle.

102 Blaudeau 2006a, ch.7, Allen 1980; Blaudeau 2006a, 534–6 briefly discusses PZ. On Blaudeau's important work see now Wickham 2007.

103 See Rist 1998, 2002, 2004, 2005, Greatrex 2006; also Witakowski, forthcoming, which may form part of another general monograph on Syriac historiography. Debié 2009a offers a useful overview of Syriac historiography, in which her own contribution (2009b) is of particular relevance, cf. Greatrex 2009 in the same volume (an abbreviated version of this chapter). Debié 2011 promises to be of great importance, but will appear too late to be taken into account in our work.

(7) Conclusion

Probably the most important conclusion to emerge from this analysis of PZ's sources and approach is the extent to which he should be viewed as a compiler, rather than as an original writer. Scholars in the past had certainly struggled to understand how someone acquainted with Gadana in 504 could have still been writing in 568/9, but the tendency remained to suppose that we were still dealing with essentially two authors, Zachariah and PZ, with the latter perhaps incorporating some earlier work; this was essentially the approach we adopted in our 2006 study.¹⁰⁴ It seems to us that the person who put the chronicle together in 568/9, whom we conventionally designate as PZ, is unlikely to have composed much of the work at all: nearly all the later books, as we have seen, are explicitly dated to the reign of Justinian, right up to xii.7.¹⁰⁵

This composite work, which, following Witakowski, we refer to as a 'Miscellaneous History', is all the more valuable for this very reason: PZ, like the church historians who preceded him, has preserved documents that otherwise would have been lost altogether. We might single out, leaving aside Zachariah's important work, itself surviving otherwise only in brief citations from Evagrius, the blow-by-blow report on Macedonius' downfall in 511, the defence of the anti-Chalcedonian bishops to the Emperor Justinian before the negotiations of 532, and the geographical survey of xii.7 as especially interesting accounts that would have been lost without his work.¹⁰⁶ With this new translation, albeit partial, we hope to give a new boost to the reputation of this relatively neglected source, so often cited, so little studied.

104 Cf. Brooks' introduction to PZV i, ii, and Greatrex 2006, 43, envisaging the possibility of several sources. It follows that it would be difficult to undertake an analysis of PZ's world-view, given the variety of sources employed, although this is noted as a *desideratum* by van Ginkel 1995, 64 n.120; cf. idem 1998, 502, noting this very problem in the case of PD.

105 This is not a conclusive argument, since John of Ephesus' works contain varying internal dates, sometimes in close proximity, as in *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 226–7: on the former page he refers to AG 877 as 'the present year', on the latter, 'down to the present', which is AG 879. Hence one could argue that PZ merely proceeded in similar fashion, only concluding his work in 880; he would thus be the author of viii–xii. See also van Ginkel 1995, 71–7, on the various times at which John worked on part III of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

106 On the 511 episode see Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009. For this general point, the value of PZ's sources, see Nau 1900b, 243–7.

D. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

PZ's work appeared in 568/9, at an encouraging time for the anti-Chalcedonian community in the East. His optimism – or that of his contemporary source – emerges very clearly from the last remaining chapter of his work (xii.7), even if it is tinged with a millenarian perspective, looking towards an imminent end of the world. There were good grounds for such an upbeat view, even if they were to be dashed over the years that followed. On the one hand, the traditional enemy, Persia, had agreed to a fifty-year peace in 562, which had now held for some six years. Furthermore, as PZ notes, king Khusro I himself was believed to have shown signs of being interested in Christianity, although this rumour appears to have been groundless. On the other hand, a certain stability had been reached on doctrinal issues. The aged emperor Justinian had died in 565, to be succeeded by his nephew Justin (II). Justin's wife, Sophia, was an anti-Chalcedonian, just as Justinian's wife Theodora had been, and negotiations were resumed in an effort to seek to reconcile the differences between the supporters and opponents of the council. Unfortunately these broke down dramatically around 568, when monks tore up a document that had been accepted by anti-Chalcedonian bishops, thus bringing to an end any attempts at compromise.¹

In order to understand the significance of the developments outlined above, it is necessary to go back to the outset of PZ's work and to provide a very basic narrative of secular and ecclesiastical developments from the mid-fifth century to the mid-sixth. We should emphasise that numerous works are available that provide such an account, and we shall therefore limit ourselves to giving a cursory overview.²

The innocent reader of PZ's work, and especially of books iii-vi – derived, as we have seen, almost exclusively from Zachariah of Mytilene – would have little idea of the momentous events that shook the western empire in the fifth century, including the dismantling of the former provinces and the unseating of the last western emperor, Romulus Augustulus, in 476. It would not be appropriate to examine such events here, but it is important to note that the two parts of the empire, divided ever since Theodosius I

1 For more detail on the time at which PZ brought out his work see Greatrex 2006, 39–41. Frend 1972, 319, on the failure of the agreement of 568. Whitby 2000b, 86–94 on Justin II.

2 See (e.g.) the general accounts in Jones 1964, 217–37, 266–302, Evans 1996, 11–95, Treadgold 1997, 149–217, Morriison 2004b, 21–36, Demandt 2008, 152–80. We have ourselves offered an overview of the period up to 518, Greatrex 2008, cf. Haldon 2008, 249–53 for the following period. The bibliography given in the footnotes below is merely introductory.

split it between his two sons, Honorius in the West and Arcadius in the East, increasingly went their separate ways. Already in the late fourth century it was becoming clear that the eastern half was the stronger, and this tendency became more pronounced in the fifth, as barbarian invaders gradually took over the western provinces. With the death of Theodosius II in 450 and the accession of Marcian – initially contested by Valentinian III in the West, who had not been consulted – the gap between the two grew wider. Marcian refused to continue paying off the Huns in the Balkans, leading them to move westwards, putting further pressure on the western empire, even if they were eventually defeated by Aetius and his coalition at the battle of the Catalaunian plains in 451.³

Both eastern and western empires were dominated to a remarkable degree by barbarian (i.e. non-Roman) leaders in this period. In the West, *magistri militum* like Ricimer came to wield more power than the emperor himself, while in the East, both Marcian and Leo owed their positions in large measure to the *magister militum* Aspar, an Alan. But whereas in the West the emperors, for the most part nominated by the *magistri militum*, were usually puppets and incapable of improving their own situation or that of the empire, in the East they proved more independent. Leo and Zeno were able to maintain themselves in power, albeit with difficulty, often by playing off various barbarian groups against one another. The Balkans in particular were unstable from the 450s to the 480s, as Gothic groups struggled with one another and with the Romans for control and for lands on which to settle. Eventually Zeno proposed to the Goths, now united under Theoderic the Amal and consequently all the more dangerous, that they take control of Italy, which they proceeded to do in the early 490s. There remained one further group that had come to exercise great influence in the eastern empire, the Isaurians; they were in fact a highland people from within the empire, from south-eastern Asia Minor, who had proved their usefulness in counteracting the Gothic menace. The Emperor Zeno himself was one of their number, but his power was frequently contested by fellow Isaurians, such as Illus and Leontius, who rebelled in 484. It was left therefore to his successor, Anastasius, to break the power of Isaurians, which he undertook almost as soon as he ascended the throne in 491.⁴

3 See Treadgold 1997, 78–102, Mitchell 2007, 96, 102–17; Burgess 1993/4 on Marcian's accession. On the Huns, Heather 2005, 313–48, Goldsworthy 2009, 314–34.

4 See Treadgold 1997, 149–73, for a useful narrative of these developments, cf. Mitchell 2007, 113–22. On the Isaurians see Brooks 1893, Elton 2000a and 2000b. Anastasius' reign is analysed in detail by Haarer 2006 and Meier 2009.

By the year 500 therefore the eastern empire was in a strong position. The Balkans remained problematic, as various tribes periodically crossed the Danube and inflicted defeats on the Roman army, but elsewhere the situation was more tranquil. The Arabian frontier was stabilised, and losses suffered during Leo's reign made good: the island of Iotabe, for instance, was retaken, and the lucrative trade with the Far East resumed. Anastasius was also able to improve the state finances dramatically, even going so far as to abolish certain taxes; no doubt the elimination of subsidies to foreign peoples, such as the Isaurians, must have made a considerable difference. It was at this juncture, however, that the eastern frontier erupted into war, leading to a series of conflicts that would culminate eventually in the seventh century in the annexation of the whole Roman East by the Persians, followed by the dramatic triumph of Heraclius over his rival, Khusro II. In 502 the Persian king Kavadh I, having unsuccessfully demanded a subsidy from Anastasius, seized several cities, including Amida, as PZ describes so vividly (vii.3–4). Although the Romans had on occasion provided the Persians with financial support in the past, helping them in their struggles against invaders from the central Asian steppes, most notably the Hephthalites, they were not under any obligation to do so. Anastasius may therefore have thought it preferable to weaken further the already enfeebled Persian kingdom: Kavadh had only just regained his throne in 498/9, brought back to power by the Hephthalites. It was a grave miscalculation, however, and Kavadh was able to recoup much booty and prestige by this successful invasion. The Roman counter-attack nevertheless restored the balance of power and forced a truce. In order to thwart any further such sudden invasions Anastasius constructed a new fortress at Dara, right on the frontier, as well as repairing many other installations that had fallen into disrepair during the decades of peace that had preceded the war of 502.⁵

So far we have left to one side the doctrinal disputes that racked the eastern empire in the period concerned. It is with these that PZ is primarily concerned, starting above all with the Council of Chalcedon of 451 (iii.1). Despite the fall of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus in 431, debate had continued as to how exactly to understand the dual nature of Christ, both human and divine. While Nestorius had placed great emphasis on Christ's humanity, to the point of being unwilling to call Mary 'God-bearer'

⁵ On the eastern frontier see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 51–2, 60–78, cf. Winter and Dignas 2007, 37–8, Mitchell 2007, 122–4. Josh. Styl. offers a detailed account of Anastasius' war in the East: see the tr. and detailed commentary of Trombley and Watt 2000 (cf. Luther 1997) with Haarer 2006, 47–65.

(Theotokos), his opponents, especially patriarch Cyril of Alexandria, set much more store by his divinity. Cyril wrote much on the topic and was by no means consistent, which, after his death in 444, allowed both Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians to lay claim to his mantle. Some of his supporters in the late 440s, notably the elderly archimandrite Eutyches, subscribed to a radical interpretation of his views, eliding the human nature of Christ, subsumed by his divine nature. Eutyches was initially condemned at a local synod in Constantinople but then rehabilitated by a general council at Ephesus (449), at which Cyril's successor Dioscorus dominated proceedings. Two years later, the Emperor Marcian held another council, this time in Chalcedon, across the Bosphorus from Constantinople; his aim was to resolve definitively the continuing disagreement as to Christ's nature. The assembled bishops, after much wrangling and some opposition, agreed to accept the duality of Christ's nature, declaring him to be 'in two natures', and not merely 'from two natures'. They based this affirmation on a letter from Pope Leo I to patriarch Flavian of Constantinople, known as the 'Tome of Leo', as well as Cyril's writings – at any rate, some of them. Although this decision was subscribed to by almost all present at the council, it nevertheless provoked fierce opposition, especially in Palestine and Egypt, as Zachariah relates. The council's opponents, often referred to (inaccurately) as Monophysites or (more accurately) as Miaphysites, believed that it had reverted to the views of Nestorius by its sharp distinction of Christ's two natures, a point particularly emphasised in Leo's Tome, and they regarded the banished Dioscorus as a martyr.⁶

Until the reign of Justin I (518–527) the general tendency of successive emperors was to downplay Chalcedon. Leo prevaricated, sounding out ecclesiastical opinion by means of his Encyclical (457–8), and for the most part maintaining imperial support for the council. Basiliscus, on the other hand, was an outspoken opponent of the council and condemned it explicitly in his *Encyclicon* of 475, but already in the following year, as a result of overwhelming pressure from the patriarch Acacius, the population of Constantinople and the intervention of the holy man Daniel the Stylite, he performed a spectacular *volte-face* in his *Antiencyclicon*. Not surprisingly, Zeno realised that the issue required more sensitive handling, and with the

6 Gray 2005 offers a first-rate introduction to these issues, cf. Frend 1972, 1–49, Gray 1979, 7–16, Meyendorff 1989, 165–78, Chadwick 2001, 524–91, Mitchell 2007, 290–1, Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 1998b, Maraval 1998a. Gaddis and Price 2005 offer a translation of the Acts of Chalcedon, together with an excellent introduction; cf. now Price and Whitby 2009, a collection of papers, most of which concern the council. On Eutyches see now Bevan and Gray 2008.

assistance of the able patriarch of Constantinople Acacius, he brought out the *Henoticon*, i.e. a unifying document, in 482. In the best tradition of diplomatic solutions, it was, in essence, a fudge, by which mention of Chalcedon was avoided altogether. Thus both supporters and opponents of the council could co-exist – so long as neither enquired too closely of the others' views. It was a well-calculated attempt to repair the divisions that were already leading, e.g. in Egypt, to the emergence of rival hierarchies, not to mention considerable unrest. But it proved inadequate, as anti-Chalcedonian extremists pushed for explicit condemnation of the council: Zachariah well brings out how hard Peter Mongus in Alexandria had to struggle to convince many of the monks of his anti-Chalcedonian orthodoxy. In the early sixth century, Severus and Philoxenus of Mabbugh hounded Flavian from office as patriarch of Antioch, although he too had been prepared to accept the *Henoticon*. The tide appeared to be moving decisively against the council, and Anastasius himself seems to have become increasingly opposed to it.⁷

The accession of Justin I in 518 brought this movement to a decisive halt. Pope Hormisdas himself visited Constantinople in the following year, bringing to an end the Acacian schism, which had lasted since pope Felix excommunicated the patriarch of Constantinople in 484. The new imperial dynasty was vigorously Chalcedonian, although Justinian (527–565), about whom a huge amount has been written in recent years, was interested in theology and made several attempts to resolve the festering issue of Christ's natures, none of which was successful. While during the reign of his uncle Justin I, at any rate from c.520 onwards, a serious clampdown on anti-Chalcedonians was implemented, leading to the closure of many monasteries in the eastern provinces and the expulsion of their monks (described by PZ at viii.5), in the late 520s the situation grew less tense. Perhaps as a consequence of renewed tensions with Persia – war had broken out again in the mid-520s – the new emperor preferred rather to open the door to negotiations with the anti-Chalcedonians. It is likely also that his wife Theodora, an anti-Chalcedonian herself, had a part to play in this change in imperial policy. In 532, just after the Nika riot, which nearly unseated Justinian and led to the death of 30,000 people in Constantinople, six representatives of the anti-Chalcedonian party held talks with Chalcedonian bishops, and even with the emperor himself. Despite these favourable circumstances and the great respect shown to each side by the other, no breakthrough resulted,

7 See Gray 1979, 17–44, idem 2005, 224–7, cf. Frend 1972, 143–233, Meyendorff 1989, 187–206, Maraval 1998b, Allen 2000, 815–20, Chadwick 2001, 592–610, Haarer 2006, 115–83.

although the emperor went out of his way to issue an edict containing a statement of faith that omitted mention of Chalcedon and used terms dear to the council's opponents. Over time a considerable community of anti-Chalcedonian monks and holy men grew up in Constantinople, sheltered by the Empress Theodora in the Palace of Hormisdas; to some extent, this allowed the imperial couple to maintain some control over this group, which otherwise might have destabilised the eastern provinces. Nevertheless a rival anti-Chalcedonian hierarchy emerged during Justinian's reign, thanks in large measure to the tireless efforts of Jacob Baradaeus, who consecrated thousands of priests, as also to the historian John of Ephesus. Justinian's own attempts at compromise were dashed by the visit of Pope Agapetus to Constantinople in 536, which led to the explicit condemnation of Severus and other leading anti-Chalcedonians. Yet the emperor never lost hope of reuniting the increasingly divided pro- and anti-Chalcedonian communities, which led eventually to his summoning of the Fifth Ecumenical Council in 553 in Constantinople. By this council he sought to draw Chalcedon's opponents back into the fold by explicitly condemning certain writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Hiba (Ibas) of Edessa that had always attracted their ire. The effect was merely to provoke fierce opposition among various leading church figures in the West without tangible results among the anti-Chalcedonians to the East.⁸

We must turn briefly to secular events before concluding this overview. PZ is well informed about Justinian's wars in the East, particularly the first one, which drew to a close in 532 through the 'Eternal Peace'. Until then, neither side had succeeded in gaining a decisive advantage in the renewed fighting: Belisarius had won an impressive victory outside the new fortress of Dara in 530, but Kavadh's forces had defeated the Romans at Callinicum in the following year. Negotiations that might have led to a rapprochement of the two sides, which aimed at Justinian guaranteeing the succession of Khusro I, Kavadh's designated successor, were scuppered by high officials on both sides, so that when Kavadh died in late 531, it looked as if the war

⁸ On Justinian as a theologian see Uthemann 1999, cf. Noethlichs 2001, 752–5. More generally on his church policy see Frend 1972, 255–95, Meyendorff 1989, 207–50, Evans 1996, 105–12, 183–92, Allen 2000, 820–8, Chadwick 2001, 612–27, Gray 2005, 227–36, van Rompay 2005, Menze 2008a (arguing that opportunities for compromise diminished steadily after 518). Michael Whitby points out (as we have argued in Greatrex 2007b) that Justinian devoted more attention to doctrinal issues during lulls in the conflict on the eastern frontier. Price 2009d offers a translation of the Acts of the Council of Constantinople (II), together with a useful introduction.

would continue. Talks resumed, however, leading to the conclusion of the peace and the preservation of the *status quo* in the East; Justinian agreed to hand over a lump sum of 11,000 lbs. of gold to the Persians, in order that he not seem to be their tributary, an impression that might have been encouraged by the concession of an annual subsidy. This gave him the free hand he needed to transfer troops to the west, allowing him to seize North Africa from the Vandals in a remarkably short space of time, and then to overrun Italy and force the Goths to surrender in 540. At this point Khusro broke the peace and took advantage of the depleted defences of the East, sacking Antioch and extorting considerable sums from various cities; PZ's account of these events survives only in chapter summaries and in brief sections in later Syriac writers. Justinian's difficulties were compounded by the outbreak of the bubonic plague, otherwise known as the 'early medieval pandemic', that swept the whole Mediterranean region from 541 onwards. Manpower shortages resulted, the Goths recovered much of Italy under the leadership of Totila, revolts took place in North Africa, and the Balkans likewise fell victim to numerous invasions. The 550s saw some recovery, despite all these setbacks: the general Narses crushed Totila and the Goths, parts even of Spain were taken over by Justinian's general Liberius, Africa came to enjoy some stability, and most of the eastern frontier was quiet. War with Persia was then confined to the Caucasus region, with both powers vying for control of Lazica and its adjoining districts, rich in manpower and natural resources. In the end, the conflict ground to a halt and the two parties were able to agree to a fifty-year peace in 562. It appeared as though, at last, peace had once again returned definitively to the East. Neither PZ nor his contemporaries were to know that a twenty-year war would be provoked by Justin II already in 572.⁹

9 On the eastern frontier under Justinian see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 81–134, Dignas and Winter 2007, 38–41, 138–48 (on the 562 treaty), Greatrex 2005. On the plague see Horden 2005, Little 2007 and the bibliography to be found at PZ x n.122. On other events, especially in the west, see (e.g.) Evans 1996, 126–54, 168–82, Cameron 1993, 104–27, Cameron 2000a, 72–8, Halsall 2007, 499–518, Goldsworthy 2009, 394–9. Excellent general works on Justinian and his period are readily available, e.g. Maraval 1999, Meier 2004b, Maas 2005.

E. TEXT AND TRANSLATION

We offer here a translation based on Brooks' edition of 1919–1924 (referred to as PZT), which restores some sections from Michael the Syrian's *Chronicle* (which we italicise). We have indicated the pagination in PZT in square brackets throughout the translation; the sequence begins anew at the start of book vi, it should be noted, since this edition is in two volumes. Brooks' edition is based primarily on manuscript A of the British Library, discussed above in section C (6), which, although it dates to c.600, is carelessly written and contains many mistakes, as he notes.¹ The book and chapter divisions are probably PZ's own, but the section divisions within the chapters are our addition, essentially for ease of reference, particularly in the long chapters. As regards the extent of our translation and the sections of books i–ii that we have omitted, we refer the reader to our discussion in the preface.

Our translation aims to keep as close to the Syriac as possible, which leads inevitably to a certain awkwardness in the English, and often to somewhat repetitive sentences. Nevertheless, we have generally sought to maintain clarity, e.g. by inserting in square brackets words not in the Syriac, but which we have supplied for the sense. When referring to Roman emperors or the Roman empire, we have translated the Syriac *malka* and *malkutha* as 'emperor' and 'empire' rather than 'king' and 'kingdom', partly because these terms are traditional, and partly to distinguish them from the Persian king and kingdom. Our annotation aims to provide comments on all aspects of the remarkably varied topics covered by PZ. We have sought to offer references to a good range of primary and secondary sources in the notes; this is in part a reflection of the extensive bibliography on the subjects covered, but we hope that it will also give the reader a number of useful leads to follow (in a variety of languages). Despite our attempts to be as thorough as possible, there will doubtless be omissions, for which we can only apologise in advance. The translation is the work of R.P. and C.H., the commentary that of G.G., although we have each exchanged suggestions about the other's contribution; the introductory sections were written by G.G., save as noted in the table of contents. As Michael Whitby rightly explains in his introduction to his translation of Evagrius, it is not possible to offer a full narrative of the doctrinal history of the fifth and sixth centuries, which may in any case be readily found elsewhere; we have given

¹ PZV i, ii–iii. Wright 1872, 1046, is rather more positive in his assessment, referring to 'a fine, regular Estrangela'.

some suggestions, however, in our brief historical introduction (section D above).

We hope that we shall be able to add a few extra comments, not to mention corrigenda and emendenda, on the web at some point. Links should be found at the TTH website (<http://www.liverpool-unipress.co.uk/>) and at that of Geoffrey Greatrex (<http://~aix1.uottawa.ca/greatrex>). In a work of this length, and despite our best efforts, it is inevitable that there will be some inconsistency in the names of places and people used. We have tried generally to use the normal classical names for places, e.g. Constantia, Martyropolis and Chalcis rather than Tella, Maipherqaṭ and Qenneshrin, but in some cases we have indicated both. They will be found cross-indexed in our index. For the Syriac letter shin we have generally used ‘sh’; we prefer ‘Bet’ to ‘Beth’, as in (e.g.) Bet Nahrain (Mesopotamia). We refer to the Arabs by the Syriac term Ṭayyayê (cf. PZ vii n.99). We have also used circumflex accents (e.g. in Urtâyê) rather than macrons to indicate long vowels.

F. ANALYSIS AND PARTIAL TRANSLATION OF BOOKS I-II

(S.B. with some additions by G.G.)

As explained in the Preface, this volume essentially does not set out to cover Books i and ii, since their content is of a very different nature from that of the remaining books, and several of the texts included are complex literary works for which there are sometimes many other witnesses, which means that these particular chapters need to be treated separately and discussed in a much wider context. Accordingly it must suffice here simply to give an outline of the contents of these two books, pointing to the relationship of the longer chapters to related literary texts, and translating only those shorter chapters that are of more relevance to the rest of the work. A similar practice was followed in the earlier translation of PZ by Hamilton and Brooks (HB), and likewise in the German translation by Ahrens and Krüger (AK). Thus, in the following outline of the contents of Books i and ii, the following parts are translated in full:

Book I: Table of Contents, chapters 1 and 9;

Book II: Introduction, chapters 2, 3 and 4, and the final historical note (from ch.5).

Title: ‘Volume of narratives of events that have occurred in the world’.

Book I

Table of Contents (PZT i, 2; PZV i, 1; HB 11).

Translation:

First chapter: An account (*pyasa*) of the commencement of the Book (*sharba*).

Second chapter: A letter of request (*pyasa*) concerning the Table of genealogies in the Book of Genesis [i.e. Genesis 10].

Third chapter: An apologia concerning the Table of genealogies, with the chronological canons, as set out below.

Fourth chapter: A letter of request (*pyasa*) concerning the translation of the Greek Book of Aseneth (Asyat) which turned up in the library of the family of Brw’,¹ the bishops from the town of Resh’aina.

Fifth chapter: The reply to the letter.

Sixth chapter: Translation of the story of Aseneth.

¹ Probably ‘Beroea’ is intended; Brooks 1918, xvii, plausibly suggests that when the Miaphysite bishop Antoninus was expelled from his see of Beroea/Aleppo in 519, he moved to Resh’aina, taking his library with him.

Seventh chapter: Translation of [the story of] Silvester, patriarch of Rome, which tells of the conversion and baptism of the believing emperor Constantine, and the disputes of the Jewish teachers.

Eighth chapter: The revelation of the treasure (consisting) of the bones of Stephen, Nicodemus, Gamaliel, and Habbib his son.

Ninth chapter: Concerning Isaac and Dodo (Dada), the Syriac teachers.

Chapter 1 (PZT i, 2–6; PZV i, 1–4; HB 12–16)

Translation:

a. First Chapter. In the case of those who were motivated like irrational wild animals, and were no more than just alive, Scripture named them as ‘flesh’ on account of their shameful habits and vicious conduct, their wild impulses and their earth-bound society (*politeia*), the bad ways that they passed on one to another, with their cultivation of the passions and corruption of the flesh, and with their foul lusts of the body. For it says, ‘My Spirit will not [3] dwell in human beings for ever, because they are flesh’.² Solomon also calls them ‘wicked’, when he says, ‘The wicked in their words and in their deeds have invoked death and considered it a friend; in their corruption they swore and made a covenant with it, since they were worthy of becoming a part of it. For they said in themselves, without thinking correctly, “Our life is short, accompanied by grief, without any healing.” And again, “At a person’s departure, no one has appeared who has been released from Sheol. For we came into being of a sudden, and after all this we return to become as if we had not existed; for our spirit is like smoke in our nostrils, and speech/reason is stirred in our heart like a spark: once it has gone out, our body becomes like ashes, and the spirit is poured out like thin air. After a time our name will be forgotten, and no one will remember our deeds. Our life has passed like a trace of the clouds, like darkness that is chased away before the rays of the sun: its heat weighs heavily upon it. For our life is like a passing shadow, and there is no remedy at our departure, for it is sealed and there is no returning. So come, let us enjoy ourselves with good things; let us eagerly make use of the created world while we are young; let us take our fill of choice wines and unguents. Do not let the air’s blossom pass us by, let us crown ourselves with rose flowers before they wilt. Let none of us be without pleasure until our old age. Let us leave a token (*symbolon*) of our pleasure all over the place, for this is our portion and this is our inheritance.”’³

² Genesis 6.3 (Peshitta).

³ Wisdom 1.16–2.9 (Peshitta, with only minor variations).

b. All these things are like those to which Moses testifies, ‘The entire earth became one tongue and one speech. And it came to pass that when they travelled from the East, they came upon a valley in the land of Sen‘ar, [4] and they resided there. One man said to another, “Come, let us mould bricks and bake them in fire.” Then bricks serve them as stone, and lime for mortar. They said, “Come, let us build a town, and a tower whose top is in heaven; and we will make a name for ourselves, so that we do not become scattered on the earth.”’⁴ So they toiled assiduously and built, labouring vainly on the tower.

c. Again, ‘the tribe of Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh, once they had returned from the rest of the tribes, their brethren, who had inherited the Land of the Promise, they came to Gilgal on the banks of the Jordan, in the land of Canaan. There they built, with the stones they had gathered, a large spectacular altar on the banks of the Jordan’.⁵ When the rest of the tribes heard of this, Phineas, son of Eleazar the priest, along with the chiefs of the congregation, the leaders of the Israelite armies, went off to them and demanded an explanation. They returned the reply: ‘It is to be a witness between us and you, so that your children do not say to our children in the future, “What have you men of Reuben and men of Gad got to do with the Lord God of Israel?” Look at the boundary which the Lord provided between us and you, the Jordan here. And we said, “Let us make a place and build ourselves an altar, not for sacrifice or for offerings, but as a witness between us and you, and between our following generations”’.⁶

d. Gideon too, after destroying the Midianites, spread out a cloak, and asked each person for a ring from the plunder that the men with him had collected; and the weight of the rings he had asked for was 1700 measures in weight. Gideon took them and made out of them a *lupra*⁷, and he set it up in his village, in ‘Ophrah. And the Israelites went astray after it, and it became a stumbling block for Gideon and his household.⁸

e. Again, the mother of Micah who was from the mountain [5] of Ephraem likewise took 1,100 pieces of silver from her son and made a carved image and a cast one.⁹

4 Genesis 11.1–4 (Peshitta). The passage concerns the Tower of Babel.

5 Joshua 22.9–10 (Peshitta).

6 Joshua 22.24–27 (Peshitta).

7 The Syriac translation (Peshitta) has misread the last letter of the Hebrew (*l-’pwd*), ‘(made them) into an Ephod’ (a cultic object), and so produced the meaningless *lupra* (*d* and *r* are very similar in Syriac script).

8 Cf. Judges 8.24–27.

9 Cf. Judges 17.1–4.

f. Again, David's son 'Absalom, while he was still alive, set up an image for himself in the valley of the kings, because he had said, "I have no one to make my name". He called the image after his own name, it being called "the hand of Absalom", until the present day'.¹⁰

g. Methodius, bishop of Olympus and martyr, in his work on the resurrection of the dead, addressed to Aglaophon, tells about a certain Pheidias, a craftsman and sculptor who made statues, how he created an ivory statue that was beautiful to behold.¹¹ In order that it should last for a long time and not become spoiled or be ruined, he poured oil under its feet and anointed the rest of the sculpture.

h. We can see images of various people in different places, and we find records written on parchment concerning all sorts of events that have occurred in the world; likewise, statues set up as honorific memorials of people who have died.

i. How right and fitting it is for eager and discerning readers that, following on from the three ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates and Theodoret, the succeeding events that took place at different times, that are scattered about and not collected together in a single volume, should be assembled and set down, based on documents, or letters, or reliable oral sources.¹² This will be for the benefit of the faithful and those who have a concern for excellence and beauty of soul. May the recording in writing of these things proceed with the assistance of Christ our God! We pray that he may give us the wisdom and eloquence to describe in an unconfusing way the truth of what has happened.

j. Because there is a certain confusion, involving differences in the Syriac manuscripts [6] from the Greek in the Table of the generations in Genesis, along with a considerably smaller number of years, it is right and fitting, and appropriate for our endeavour, that we should commence with the Book of Genesis, and after this the Book of Aseneth, followed by the accounts of Silvester and the emperor Constantine's instruction (*katêchêsis*)

10 2 Samuel 18.18 (Peshitta).

11 Methodius, *De Resurrectione*, 35.3, pp.274–5. The passage is not among the excerpts from this work in florilegia: see Pitra 1883, 202–5. See also Greatrex 2006, 44 and n.38, noting that the common denominator among the preceding extracts and this allusion is monuments designed to perpetuate the memory of a person or event, and arguing for parallels in Thdrt. *HE*; cf. Riad 1988, 104–5, on this preface. Methodius is also referred to at ii.1 (115/80) in the context of a controversy that raged in the 440s as to the reality of the resurrection: see Honigmann 1953d, 142, 145–7, noting PZ's erudition.

12 See C (3)(iv-v) above on PZ's use of the earlier church historians, C (2) on their influence on his work.

and baptism, of which Eusebius and Socrates¹³ gave a less than accurate and truthful account: it was not the case that the emperor was baptised at the end of his life, as they wrote, for the history of his instruction at the hands of Silvester is preserved, both in writing and in depictions, in Rome, in specific locations: people who were there and have seen them have reached us and have related to us about them.¹⁴

k. I will also write about the revelation of the precious bones of Stephen and his companions, and about Isaac and Dodo, the Syriac teachers. At that point we will end the First Book. Following it we will describe the rest of what we have discovered, in the separate Books and chapters that will be found written below, covering from the 32nd year of Arcadius' son Theodosius up to the year 880 of the Greeks [A.D. 568/9].

l. Lest readers or listeners find fault with us, we are perfectly aware that we do not refer to emperors as 'victorious and mighty', or generals as 'astute warriors', or bishops as 'holy and blessed', or monks as 'chaste and of weighty conduct': this is because our concern is to give an account of facts, following in the footsteps of the Holy Scriptures, and not to praise and glorify leading figures out of flattery; nor is it our purpose to blame and revile, rebuking those who believe differently from us – provided only that we do not find anything of this sort in the documents and letters that we are going to translate.¹⁵

Chapter 2 (PZT i, 7–8; PZV i, 4–5. On the Table of genealogies).

Chapter 3 (PZT i, 8–17; PZV i, 5–12. On the Table of genealogies).

Chapter 4 (PZT i, 17–19; PZV i, 12–13. Letter on Joseph and Aseneth).

Chapter 5 (PZT i, 19–21; PZV i, 13–15. Reply concerning Joseph and Aseneth). [The end is lost]

Chapter 6 (PZT i, 21–55; PZV i, 15–39. Joseph and Aseneth).

Probably dating from about the first century A.D., this work which took as its starting point the few references to Aseneth in Genesis (41.45, 50; 46.20),

13 Socr. *HE* i.39, cf. Euseb. *VC* iv.61–2 with Cameron and Hall, 340–1. Whether PZ was familiar with the *VC* is uncertain; Cameron and Hall, 50, note the existence of a Syriac translation of the work (of unknown date). See further i.7 below on this episode.

14 See p.48 for our suggestion that Isaac of Antioch/Amida may have seen these illustrations in Rome.

15 This apology recalls Socr. *HE* vi.pr.7–8, ed. Hansen, p.310.22–6, cf. Greatrex 2006, 45, noting similarities also with the proem to book v of Socrates' work.

came to enjoy great popularity, and was translated into many different languages in Late Antiquity. The Greek text is transmitted in a number of different recensions, and the Syriac translation was made from the recension 'b'.¹⁶ The name of the translator is given in chapter 4 as Mushe (Moses) of Aggel (Ingilene), who also translated Cyril of Alexandria's *Glaphyra*.¹⁷ The main variants of this Syriac translation were given by E.W. Brooks in his English translation of recension 'a' of the Greek original, *Joseph and Asenath. The Confession and Prayer of Asenath, Daughter of Pentephres the Priest* (London, 1918).

Chapter 7 (PZT i, 56–93; PZV i, 39–65. Silvester, bishop of Rome, and the baptism of Constantine).

BHG 1628–9; *BHL* 7725–42; *BHO* 1069. Constantine was baptised shortly before his death in 337 by Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia. Since Eusebius of Nicomedia was a supporter of Arius, this was seen as an embarrassment, and so the perceived problem was resolved in two successive ways: (1) the Eusebius in question was identified as Eusebius, bishop of Rome. This solution is to be found, for example, in the earliest Greek text of the Finding of the Cross.¹⁸ In due course, however, it was realised that the dates of Eusebius of Rome (April to August 309 or 310), posed a problem, and this was solved by the second solution; (2) the bishop of Rome in question was not Eusebius, but Silvester, 314–35 (his dates demand an earlier date for Constantine's baptism, a point specifically alluded to in the Introduction to this First Book. The first attestation of this tradition in Greek is in the *Chronicle* of John Malalas (13.2), probably dating from the early 530s, but PZ is the earliest witness to the full legend.¹⁹ A shorter version of the same Syriac text, omitting the dispute with the Jews,²⁰ is to be found in BL Add.12,174 (dated 1197).²¹ The earliest forms of both the original Latin and the Greek translation have not yet been published (an edition of the former, by W. Pohlkamp, has been promised). A long narrative poem on the baptism

¹⁶ Burchard 1996, 298.

¹⁷ Unpublished, apart from Mushe's interesting Preface and Homily i, which are given by Guidi 1886. See further C (3) (vi)(b) and (vii)(a) above.

¹⁸ Ed. Nestle 1895, 325.

¹⁹ See especially Levison 1924, esp.224–39; Loenertz 1975, 426–39; Pohlkamp 1992, esp.132–48 ('Textfassungen'); also C (3) (vii)(b) above, with further references.

²⁰ On this dispute see Linder 1976.

²¹ A German translation, indicating the variants of Add.12,174, is provided in Ryssel 1896.

of Constantine is attributed to Jacob of Serug (d.521);²² in this the scene is Rome, but the bishop is unnamed, and the role of Helena is entirely different.

Chapter 8 (PZT i, 93–103; PZV i, 65–71. The Revelation concerning the discovery of the Bones of St Stephen).²³

BHG 1648; *BHL* 7850–6; *BHO* 1087. The Greek text was published by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, in *Analekta Hierosolymitikes Stachylogias* V.30 (St Petersburg, 1898), pp. 28–53. The account is given under the name of Loukianos (Lucian), of the village Kfar Gamla, ‘twenty and a half miles distant from Jerusalem’. The date of the initial revelation is given as the 3rd hour of the night, Friday, 3rd Kanun I [December], Indiction 14, consuls being Honorius for the tenth time, and Theodosius for the sixth’. This indeed fits December 415. The same Syriac version is also transmitted separately, in Berlin, Sachau 222, edited by P. Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (Paris/Leipzig, 1892), pp.188–99; there are also fragments of a version in Christian Palestinian Aramaic.²⁴

Chapter 9 (PZT i, 103; PZV i, 71–2; HB 17. The Syriac teachers Isaac and Dodo).

Translation:

a. Chapter nine tells about the Syriac teachers Isaac and Dodo who lived in the time of the believing emperors Arcadius and Theodosius.²⁵

Isaac the teacher appeared in Syria [or among the Syrians], belonging to one of the monastic establishments, the Monastery of the Westerners. He made the effort to go to Rome, reaching other cities as well. He has profitable writings on the Holy Scriptures, dealing with all kinds of topics, following (in the tradition of) Ephraem and his disciples.

22 Jac. Ser. *Hom. Bap. Con.*; the text of the older version is reprinted in the additional vol.VI, pp.297–323, of the Gorgias Press reprint (2006) of P. Bedjan, *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis*; an English tr. is in preparation.

23 On this text see Peeters 1950, 53–8 and Martin 1958, 419–33; also Bovon 2003, 279–315 (294–311 on texts of the Revelation).

24 Ed. Schulthess 1905, 102–7.

25 There were at least three different Syriac poets named Isaac during the fifth and sixth centuries, and much uncertainty surrounds the allocation of the many extant poems attributed to an Isaac; for a recent study of the question, see Bou Mansour 2005 and section C (3)(viii) (b) above, suggesting that he may be PZ’s source for the story of the baptism of Constantine. The Dodo mentioned here is otherwise unknown; see PZ viii.5a for reference to another Dodo who must be distinguished from this one.

b. Dodo was an experienced monk from the village Samqe, in the territory of Amida. As a result of the captivity and famine that occurred in that region during his time, he was sent by the leaders of the people to the emperor, and was very well received. As it appears to us, this man has more or less 300 works, on every subject, taken from the divine Scriptures, on the saints, and *madrashe* [hymns].

End of the ninth chapter which tells of the Syriac doctors Isaac and Dodo.

Book II

Introduction (PZT i, 103–5; PZV i, 72–3; HB 18–19), i.e. **ii.0**

Translation

a. After the *Ecclesiastical (History)* of Eusebius of Caesarea, both Socrates and Theodoret composed histories, down to the 32nd year of the reign of Theodosius the Younger.²⁶ In these they described, as best as they could, and to serve as a profitable record for discerning (readers), the events and affairs that occurred in different places, about which they strove to learn, basing themselves on the documents, letters, [104] records and oral sources that they had investigated.

b. Accordingly, despite my deficiencies, at your request and on your pressing advice, my brother, I shall make a beginning of writing, speaking out the truth, for the instruction of the brethren, the pleasure of lovers of learning, and the edification of the faithful. At your prayers may Christ, our Lord and our God, be willing to assist, granting me the strength to speak without confusion or occasion for blame.

c. In making a beginning for the writing of this Second Book I will relate what I have been able to learn from records and Acta (*pepragmena*), or from letters, setting out the truth from what was examined.²⁷ I will do this as succinctly as possible so as not to prolong the discourse with the result that the reader tires and the hearer gets bored. I will set down here the true account of the bodily resurrection of the seven young men in the cave, in the region of Ephesus, which took place in the time of the emperor Theodosius; also the records that were discovered in Syria. I do this for the commemoration of the saints and for the glory of God who is able to accomplish all things.

d. Then I shall set out in chapters what happened in the remaining ten years of the life of Theodosius. I will do this cursorily, so that the account of the matters in various places, described on a single occasion and separately, that

26 On PZ's use of earlier church historians see section C (3)(iv).

27 See section C (3)(iv) on these sources.

are found in Acta, should not grow too big. That is to say, in this Book I will describe what happened in Constantinople to the abbot Eutyches, and to Flavian the bishop, and the synod of the thirty-one bishops and twenty-two abbots who gathered and effected the deposition of Eutyches. Likewise concerning the second synod [105] which took place in Ephesus concerning Flavian, in the time of Dioscorus, Juvenal and Domnus, together with 128 bishops.

Then I will begin with the Third Book.

Chapter 1 (PZT i, 105–22; PZV i, 74–85. The Seven Sleepers of Ephesus).

BHG 1593–9; *BHO* 1012–22. This immensely popular story, probably originating in Ephesus in the middle of the fifth century,²⁸ was soon translated from Greek into both Syriac and Latin, and in the early seventh century it found its way into the Qur'an (*Sura* 18). It concerns a group of seven or eight young men who fled from the persecution of Christians that broke out during the reign of Decius (251–253) into a cave near Ephesus; the entrance was then blocked up, and they woke up some 190 years later, during the reign of Theodosius. Five closely related prose versions, and one verse adaptation, of this popular legend are preserved in Syriac sources. Much of the version in PZ corresponds word for word with that incorporated into the Zuqnin Chronicle (PD)²⁹ of the late eighth century, although at certain places the texts of these two versions differ in important respects: thus in PZ there are seven Sleepers, against eight in the Zuqnin Chronicle (their names also differ). A third related prose version, not quite complete, is preserved in a very early manuscript, St Petersburg MS NS 4, which may even date from the late fifth century (an edition of this, by E. Meshcherskaya and N. Smelova, is in preparation); here the title gives the number of the Sleepers as eight, but unfortunately their names are not preserved. Two further related prose accounts support eight as the number, as does the verse account, by Jacob of Serug (d.521),³⁰ where the narrative is for the most part very close to the prose versions. An early witness to the number and names as given in PZ is the pilgrim Theodosius (c.530),³¹ while Gregory of Tours in his *Passio*

28 Thus Honigmann 1953d. See also section C (3)(vii)(d). For an overview of the legend see *ODB*, 1883.

29 PD i, 135–43/101–7, 195–206/145–53.

30 Edited by Guidi 1884–5, 18–23, and included in the extra sixth volume, pp.324–30, of the reprint of P. Bedjan, *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis* (Paris/Leipzig, 1902–1910; repr. Piscataway, NJ, 2006). English tr. in Brock 2007, where information can also be found about the two further prose texts. A translation of the parallel versions in PZ and the Zuqnin Chronicle (PD) is in preparation.

31 Theod. *De situ*, 148.

*septem dormientium*³² is the first to conflate the two sets of names, claiming that the second set were their new baptismal names. It is worth emphasising that although for modern historians there is a clear distinction between this legendary tale and the remaining, more historical, chapters of this book, there is no reason to suppose that PZ would have recognised it. As Ernest Honigsmann rightly argued, PZ's history begins with book ii and with this tale, which he considered trustworthy and derived from reliable sources, no less so than the details of the councils that follow.³³

Chapter 2 (PZT i, 122–5; PZV i, 85–7; HB 19–22. On Eutyches)

Translation:

a. Chapter two concerns the heresy of the priest Eutyches, and his deposition (*kathairesis*).³⁴ There was a certain priest and abbot, Eutyches, amongst those living in Constantinople, a recluse, during the time of the emperor Theodosius. He used to be visited by many people who happened to be in Constantinople, in particular those soldiers of the Palace who had a penchant for (Church) doctrine, and they would come thronging to him because of (his) chastity and piety. This was because at that time Nestorius, who had been deposed for improper teaching, was being justly reviled: he held and taught a low opinion concerning the embodiment of God the Word, and he understood two natures after the union, (acting) separately, in Christ our God. He also held the prior existence of the infant who was conceived and fashioned in the Virgin, calling him 'Jesus' and 'Christ'; and he supposed that God the Word subsequently tabernacled in him³⁵, almost the same as Paul of Samosata,³⁶ and following the teaching of the followers of Diodore (of Tarsus),³⁷ which he very much liked and agreed with. As for the holy ever-virgin Mary, he all too readily refused to accept calling her 'Bearer of God', as the true teachers who were before him did, namely Athanasius, Gregory, Basil, Julius [123]

32 Greg. Tur. *Passio*, 761–2.

33 See Honigsmann 1953d, 138–9, showing that the work thus begins to relate events in 448 (despite i.1 and its reference to 440). *Ibid.* 137–8 on the difficulties of chronological calculations in Theodosius' reign.

34 On the events surrounding Eutyches, see especially Schwartz 1929, van Roey 1964/7, 87–91, Wessel 2004, 279–83, Bevan and Gray 2008 and PZ iii n.11.

35 John 1.14, where the Syriac Gospels have 'tabernacled in us'; according to Philoxenus (and others), Nestorius altered the Gospel text, taking the verse to intend 'flesh came into being, and the Word tabernacled in it'. For the various interpretations given by Syriac authors to this verse see Brock 1993, esp. 73–6.

36 See PZ iii n.140 on Paul's unorthodox beliefs.

37 On whom see PZ iii n.25.

and the rest;³⁸ instead, he was finding fault with them, as is testified by the letter he wrote from the Oasis to the clergy and citizens (of Constantinople).³⁹ Consequently, since many were disturbed by his teaching, a Council of 193 bishops assembled in Ephesus and examined his teaching.⁴⁰ It summoned him three times, in accordance with the canonical rule of the Church, to make his defence, to renounce his sermons, and to confess that Jesus, God the Word who became incarnate, is a single hypostasis and nature, in accordance with the accurate teaching of the doctors of the holy Church. (Nestorius), however, refused, as Socrates recounts briefly concerning him,⁴¹ while the Acts (of the Council) set out at length.⁴² His deposition by this (Council) took place in the time of Celestine, Cyril and Juvenal, prior to the arrival of John of Antioch and the bishops who were with him, who had been delayed.⁴³

b. It was roughly at this time that Eutyches, wanting to establish the one nature in Christ, denied the reality of the body from the Virgin, which God the Word had taken in and from her. Also, in his talks with those who met up with him, this same Eutyches, being uninstructed (in theology),⁴⁴ was affirming an inaccurate dogma, using in his teaching the analogy of the atmosphere which, as a result of the wind,⁴⁵ becomes embodied in the form of rain or snow; or of water which, as a result of the cold atmosphere, becomes ice.⁴⁶

38 Athanasius of Alexandria, Gregory of Nazianzus (or of Nyssa), Basil of Caesarea, pope Julius, all of whom are quoted in the letter of Timothy Aelurus at PZ iv.12.

39 Nau 1910 offers an edition of this work, with a tr. by Brooks. In it Nestorius refutes extracts from Gregory, Julius, Basil of Caesarea, Celestine of Rome and Proclus of Constantinople (pp.277–8/280). This same letter was subsequently quoted by Philoxenus, *Letter to the Monks of Senun*, 18–19/15.

40 Mich. Syr. viii.4 (173a/16) and Barheb. CE 147/8, both explicitly drawing on PZ, give the same figure of 193 bishops present, cf. AK 297. ACO i.1.2, pp.54–64, lists 197 signatories, cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.945 (ACO ii.3, pp.228–36), Chadwick 2001, 533, Wessel 2004, 160.

41 HE vii.34. For a narrative of Ephesus see Fraisse-Coué 1995, 507–42, Chadwick 2001, 530–6, Wessel 2004, 138–80.

42 As we have noted above, section C (3)(v), PZ clearly had such records at his disposal, from which he no doubt derived his figure of 193 bishops in attendance (which is not in Socr.).

43 See Fraisse-Coué 1995, 526–32, Chadwick 2001, 533–5, Wessel 2004, 168–73.

44 Cf. Bevan and Gray 2008, 619, noting that pope Leo held the same critical view of the aged archimandrite.

45 The Syriac word here, *ruha*, can also mean ‘spirit’.

46 This particular analogy is not reported elsewhere (save in Barheb. CE 147/8), but cf. PZ v.4a and Leont. *Test.* 1818B for comparable analogies. The implication is that Christ’s humanity is not genuine. Bevan and Gray 2008, 644–9, argue convincingly, however, that Eutyches was rather just a hard-line supporter of Cyril of Alexandria; see esp. 648 on his supposed rejection of Christ’s humanity. See also Chadwick 2001, 554–5 and below PZ iii n.11.

c. When word was circulated of his improper teaching, he was investigated by Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum, who happened to be [124] in the city.⁴⁷ He informed the bishop, Flavian about it, and gave him a written statement.⁴⁸ (Eutyches) was summoned three times by the 31 bishops who happened to be there, along with 22 abbots, and told to come and make a defence of his views;⁴⁹ he would also be questioned by them, and asked to make a written statement of correct belief. At first he was unwilling to come, on one occasion saying that he had a rule of perpetual reclusion,⁵⁰ and then again, that he was an old man and ill with a cough.⁵¹ In doing this he was relying on the support of his acquaintances among the soldiers at the Palace.⁵² The emperor came to learn of all this, and finally when there was a decree that he should be deposed, he was forced to turn up at the gathering of the bishops.⁵³ He did not recant his views, fully consenting, but instead he was in the habit of (just) saying, 'as you teach that there are two natures in Christ, so do I say too'.⁵⁴ The full discussion of all this is expressly recorded in sequential order in the Acts of (that synod) there.⁵⁵ We excuse ourselves

47 On whom see section B, n.33 above, PZ iii n.21.

48 Eusebius' indictment, presented at the Home Synod of Constantinople (November 448), is preserved in part in *Acts Chalc.* I.225, 230 (ACO ii.1.1, pp.100–1); a helpful introduction to the events surrounding the controversy over Eutyches can be found in Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 111–21, cf. 25–30; see also Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 41–3, Bevan and Gray 2008.

49 Cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.553 gives rather 30 bishops and 23 archimandrites (ACO ii.1.1, pp.145–7), cf. section C (3)(v).

50 *Acts Chalc.* I.359 (ACO ii.1.1, p.124.15–17), cf. Bevan and Gray 2008, 632.

51 *Acts Chalc.* I.414 (ACO ii.1.1, p.130), although not specifying that he suffered from a cough in particular, cf. Bevan and Gray 2008, 635.

52 *Acts Chalc.* I.463 (ACO ii.1.1, pp.137–8) reports the arrival of Eutyches at the seventh session of the synod of Constantinople 'along with a large following of soldiers [referring either to soldiers or members of the imperial bureaucracy], monks and members of the prefect's staff' (tr. Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 215), cf. Bevan and Gray 2008, 638–9, noting the presence also of the patrician Florentius at the proceedings on this day (22 November) at the emperor's request. They argue that both Florentius and Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, were working to bring down Eutyches (against the traditional view, according to which Florentius genuinely backed Eutyches, cf. e.g. Ste. Croix 2006, 276–7).

53 Here PZ seems to have misunderstood the Acts, since it was when he turned up in person on 22 November that he was condemned.

54 Cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.522, 524 (ACO ii.1.1, pp.142–3), where he concludes each declaration by saying 'since your sacredness has said it, I say it.' From his exchanges it is clear that he insisted on there being one nature in Christ after the union, claiming thereby that he was faithfully following Cyril in his views (*Acts Chalc.* I.543, ACO ii.1.1, p.144). See Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 27–8, Bevan and Gray 2008, 638–44.

55 *Acts Chalc.* I.458–552 (ACO ii.1.1, pp.137–47) for the exchanges, albeit with some

from relating this again, writing it down in detail here, in order to avoid lengthening our narrative; instead, we will compress it into many short parts, as the Sage says.⁵⁶

d. So his deposition took place. In the cross-questionings and in the interventions (*dialalias*), in particular in what was discussed with him by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, two natures after the union was specifically taught, close to the teaching of Nestorius.⁵⁷ The intervention of Flavian was of the same opinion.⁵⁸ Since Eutyches had been questioned by associates of Flavian and Eusebius, who had deposed him, he send a *libellus* [125] to Rome, to Leo, the bishop there, urging that his case be examined at another synod.⁵⁹ He received a reply. But when Flavian and his associates heard of this, they too wrote to Leo,⁶⁰ sending him the Acta concerning Eutyches. (Leo) then wrote the letter to Flavian known as the ‘Tome’,⁶¹ in which there are many sections with which fault is found by the dogmatic (*dogmatikoi*) teachers, matters that were objected to at the time by Dioscorus and those with him, and again by the great Timothy⁶² who succeeded him, and by numerous writings of other men, which we omit from mentioning or recording any further here.

interruptions from later councils at which they were quoted (notably Ephesus II). It should be clear from the refs. above that PZ had access to the Acts themselves.

⁵⁶ Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira) 32[35].8.

⁵⁷ Quite correct. His accuser Eusebius asks him, ‘Do you acknowledge, lord archimandrite, two natures after the incarnation...?’ (*Acts Chalc.* I.490, tr. Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 219, *ACO* ii.1.1, p.140).

⁵⁸ Probably an allusion to *Acts Chalc.* I.513 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.142), where Flavian asks whether Eutyches acknowledges the phrase ‘from two natures’.

⁵⁹ This is *CPG* 5948; for Leo’s reply, see *CPG* [5953]. See Blaudeau 2006b 145 n.24 on Eutyches’ various appeals and Leo’s reply. *Lib. Brev.* 12/117 reports that Eutyches turned to Dioscorus to ask that another council be summoned, cf. Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 46.

⁶⁰ *CPG* 5933. Flavian actually wrote twice to Leo, once in late 448 (*ep.* 22, to be found in *ACO* ii.1.1, pp.36–7), a letter which took a long time to reach Leo, and so he also despatched *ep.* 26 (to be found in *ACO* ii.1.1, pp.38–40, *CPG* 5935) in response to communications from Leo that had reached him in the meantime. See Fraisse-Coué 1995, 45–6, Neil 2009, 38–9.

⁶¹ Read at the Second Session of the Council of Chalcedon; see PZ iii n.30.

⁶² Timothy II Aelurus, anti-Chalcedonian Patriarch of Alexandria, on whom see PZ iv n.11. On his writings against Chalcedon and the Tome see PZ iii n.30, PZ iv n.17.

Chapter 3 (PZT i,125–6; PZV i, 87; HB 22–3. Second Council of Ephesus, 449)

Translation

a. Chapter 3 deals with the Second Council of Ephesus,⁶³ which concerned bishop Flavian and the monk Eutyches.

The Council gathered concerning Flavian and Eutyches in Ephesus for a second time, in the presence of the delegates sent by Leo, together with his Letter. 188 bishops attended.⁶⁴ The chief leaders were Dioscorus of Alexandria,⁶⁵ Juvenal of Jerusalem,⁶⁶ and Domnus of Antioch.⁶⁷ The Acts (*pepragmena*) of what had taken place in Constantinople concerning Eutyches were examined, and Flavian and Eusebius were deposed.⁶⁸ A clamour was raised by the bishops there and they anathematised anyone who speaks of ‘two natures in Christ after the union’.⁶⁹ There was also an enquiry concerning what Theodoret [126] of Cyrrhus had written in censure of the Twelve Chapters that Cyril had composed against Nestorius who had been banished;⁷⁰ also concerning the Letter of Hiba (Ibas) of Edessa which he had

63 The Acts, preserved in full only in Syriac translation, are edited, with German translation in *Acts Eph. II*; English tr. by Perry; a more recent tr. of the sessions concerning Hiba (Ibas) is given by Doran 2006, 133–88. The First Session of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon went over many aspects of Ephesus II (tr. Price and Gaddis, i, 122–365, with a useful table on p. 113 indicating materials from Ephesus II). The Syriac acts are discussed in detail in Millar 2009.

64 *Acts Chalc.* 1067 (*ACO* ii.3.1, pp. 252–8, section 1070 in this version) gives a list of some 140 signatories, cf. Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 358. See also Millar 2006, 258.

65 On whom see PZ iii n.17.

66 On whom see PZ iii n.44.

67 Domnus was deposed at Ephesus II, even though he acquiesced in several decisions of the council: see Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 63, Chadwick 2001, 565, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 36. Frend 1972, 33–43, offers more detail, noting how Domnus had backed Theodoret, thus incurring Dioscorus’ hostility.

68 See *Acts Chalc.* I.962 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.191) for Dioscorus’ condemnation of Flavian, archbishop of Constantinople, and Eusebius of Dorylaeum, with Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 32–3. The *Acts Chalc.* confirm that the proceedings of Constantinople in 448 were indeed read out before this condemnation: see the table in Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 113–14.

69 Cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.527–9 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.143), where the council endorses Eutyches’ statement, ‘I acknowledge that our Lord came into being from two natures before the union; but after the union I acknowledge one nature’ (tr. Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 222, with Frend 1972, 41). They thus took a strongly Cyrillian line, following in particular his Twelve Chapters (on which see PZ iii n.18). See Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 63–4, Chadwick 2001, 561, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 116, Bevan and Gray 2008, 647.

70 On Theodoret’s attack on Cyril’s Twelve Chapters see PZ iii n.23. For the enquiry into his works and his condemnation see *Acts Eph. II*, 85–113, with Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 62–3, Chadwick 2001, 565, Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 20–1.

written to Mari of Nisibis⁷¹ against Cyril and concerning Nestorius, and about what he had said in his sermons about Jesus Christ and Mary according to the testimony of his deacons who were his accusers.⁷² Also deposed were the partisans of John of Aegae and others.⁷³ The abbot Eutyches was accepted since he had made a *libellus* of repentance for the Council there, and had confessed the true faith.⁷⁴ The Council appointed Anatolius in Constantinople, in place of Flavian.⁷⁵

Chapter 4 (PZT i, 126–7; PZV i, 87–8; HB 23–4. Succession of archbishops)

Translation

a. Chapter 4 deals with the succession (*katastasis*) of archbishops⁷⁶ from the First Council of Ephesus until the death of the emperor Theodosius in the time of Valentinus.⁷⁷ After him was Marcian who assembled the Council in Chalcedon in Bithynia in the year 764 of Alexander of the Greeks [A.D. 452/3].⁷⁸

It is relevant to our discourse to give an account concerning the succession

71 The identity of the addressee of Hiba's famous Letter (*CPG* 6500) remains uncertain; in the Acts of Ephesus II he is named 'Mari the Persian' (*Acts Eph. II.* 48). Although Persia could include Nisibis (in Persian hands since 363), it could also mean 'of Fars' (hence he is sometimes identified as the bishop of Rev Ardashir, taking Mari as an honorific title ('my lord'), and supposing that the name has been lost); 'Persian' could, however, simply denote his place of origin (thus van Esbroeck 1987). See also PZ iii n.24.

72 See *Acts Eph. II.*, 3–68, with Doran 2006, 118–30, 176–88; cf. Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 61–2, Chadwick 2001, 563–4.

73 John, bishop of Aegae, was a Nestorian correspondent of Theodoret to whom the bishop of Cyrrhus wrote to justify his adherence to Chalcedon. See Gray 1979, 85–7, Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 26. *Acts Eph. II.*, 68–85 records the deposition of other bishops such as Daniel of Carrhae (nephew of Hiba), Irenaeus of Tyre, Aquilinus of Byblus, and Sophronius of Tella (Constantia), the cousin of Hiba. See Frend 1972, 42, Chadwick 2001, 564, Millar 2009, 59 (a useful summary of the Acts). Mich. Syr. viii.7 (183c/33) gives their names and in general offers more detail on the council: he might here have been relying on a fuller version of PZ (or, of course, on the Acts themselves).

74 A reference to *Acts Chalc.* I.157 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.90–1), which quotes Eutyches' plaint (*libellus*) to the council of Ephesus; it continues at I.164, I.185 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.92, 94–6), at the end of which he affirms his orthodoxy.

75 PZ is in error on this point: Anatolius was only appointed archbishop in November 449 or perhaps later: see Chadwick 1955, 23–4.

76 The Syriac *rishay kahne* is a calque on Greek *archiereis*.

77 A slightly garbled reference to the western emperor Valentinian III (425–455).

78 The same date may be found at iii.0a; it is, of course, somewhat inaccurate. The Council in fact was in session from 8 Oct. to 1 Nov. 451, which would correspond to 763 in the Seleucid era. The dating presumably comes from the chronicle source of PZ, cf. section C (3)(ii).

of bishops from the First Council of Ephesus up to the death of Theodosius.⁷⁹ This is as follows:⁸⁰

In Rome: after Celestine, there was Leo, for 21 years and 43 days.⁸¹

In Alexandria: after Cyril, Dioscorus, for 8 years and three months.⁸²

In Constantinople: Maxim<ian>us, for two years and two months; after him came Proclus, for two years and two month [deleted]; and after him, Flavian, for six years; after him, Anatolius, for eight years.⁸³

In Antioch: after John, Domnus, and following him, Maximus.⁸⁴

And in Jerusalem: Juvenal, for 36 years; [127] he was present in all three Councils, owing to the length of his tenure.⁸⁵

Chapter 5 (PZV i,127–43; PZT i, 88–9; HB 24–38. The Letter of Proclus to the Armenians).

Proclus' famous Letter to the Armenians (*CPG* 5897), probably written in 435, has come down to us in its Greek original in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.⁸⁶ Besides the text provided in PZ, the Letter is known in Syriac from two further witnesses, BL Add.14,557 and Add.12,156; the former was published by P. Bedjan at the end of his edition of Nestorius' *Liber Heracleidis* (pp.596–615), and represents the same translation as that in PZ, while the latter, incorporated into an anti-Chalcedonian florilegium, remains unpublished. In a study of the transmission of Proclus' Letter,⁸⁷

79 This recalls PZ iii.1a, in which Zach. promises to recount the heads of the church for the period with which he is concerned. PZ seems to have been interested in the succession as well, adding details to the portions of his work derived from Zach. See sections B (3)(ii), C (3)(iii).

80 There are some small differences in the reproduction of this chapter by Mich. Syr. viii.7 (183c/33–4): Leo is given 20 years, not 21; for Constantinople, no mention is made of Maximianus, and the passage reads: 'after Proclus, Flavian, for 6 years; after he was deposed, Anatolius; subsequently he too was found to be a heretic'; and under Antioch it is also added that Domnus was deposed.

81 Celestine (429–432) was succeeded by Xystus III (432–440), who was in turn succeeded by Leo I (the Great, 440–461), who, according to the *Lib. Pont.* i, 238, tr. Davis, 38, reigned '21 years, 1 month and 13 days', i.e. well nigh precisely what PZ has. See also appendix 2 for details of ecclesiastical office-holders.

82 Cyril was patriarch from 412 to 444, see PZ iii n.15; on Dioscorus see PZ iii n.17.

83 Maximianus' tenure lasted from 431 to 434; he was succeeded by Proclus (434–446), who in turn was succeeded by Flavian (446–449), then Anatolius (449–458). PZ's chronology is thus somewhat amiss.

84 John I (429–442), Domnus II (442–449), Maximus (450–456).

85 See PZ iii n.44: he was archbishop, then patriarch, 422–458.

86 *ACO* iv.2, pp.187–95. See also section C (3)(vi)(c) on this letter.

87 van Rompay 1985.

L. van Rompay was able to show that the Syriac translation in Add.12,156 (a manuscript which must date from before 562) represents a more literal (and hence, later) translation than that in Add.14,577, and that the text of the earlier version, best represented in Add.14,577, had been adapted here and there in the version incorporated into PZ. This adaptation not only involves the abbreviation of the beginning and ending of the Letter, but also the ‘updating’ of some phraseology used in connection with the Incarnation and the introduction of the term ‘God-bearer’ for Mary (*Theotokos* is not present in Proclus’ Letter). Van Rompay was also able to show that the later version, in Add.12,156, must have been made before 522–3, when Philoxenus quotes from it.

Historical note, end of ii.5 (PZT i, 143–4; PZV i, 99; HB 38).

Translation

Now Theodosius lived for fifty years, as the Chronicle indicates.⁸⁸ Of these he reigned for forty-two years, having come to the throne aged eight.⁸⁹ The affairs of thirty-two years of his reign are related in Socrates’ *Ecclesiastical (History)*,⁹⁰ while the remaining ten years are recorded in brief above in this Second Book.

He died in the 308th Olympiad, and after him Marcian reigned.⁹¹

In the year 764 of the Greek reckoning of Alexander⁹² he assembled the Synod of 567 bishops in Chalcedon, the affairs of whom we shall describe briefly as far as possible in this Third Book, written down below, in its (separate) chapters. (This is taken) for the most part from the History of Zachariah, an eloquent man who wrote in Greek, (addressed) to someone called Eupraxius who was resident in the imperial court and was engaged in the imperial service.

The body of the holy bishop John, called Chrysostomos, was returned from (the place of his) exile, [144] and was held in honour in Constantinople with a procession.⁹³

88 On the chronicle source see section C (3)(ii).

89 Broadly correct: born in 402, Theodosius reigned as sole eastern emperor from 408 to 450. See *PLRE* ii, Theodosius 6.

90 See section C (3)(iv) on this. PZ thus intends this book to cover the period from 440 to 450, the point at which Zach.’s work began.

91 In fact, Olympiad 308 lasted from 453 to 457, and so Marcian’s accession in 450 is here misdated.

92 See n.78 above on the (incorrect) date here. The other details in this paragraph are probably derived from the opening of PZ iii.

93 These concluding entries, and their relationship to PZ’s chronicle source, are discussed

The Empress Eudocia, the wife of Theodosius, went to Jerusalem for the purpose of prayer, and returned; and then she died.⁹⁴

ZRZYRKWS⁹⁵ took Carthage in Africa and ruled there. The *stratêlatês* John was killed by the servants of Areobindus.⁹⁶ There were earthquakes in various places;⁹⁷ and then Theodosius died.⁹⁸

in section C (3)(ii). John Chrysostom, who had proved a controversial archbishop of Constantinople, died in exile at Comana in September 407. On the return of John's remains to the capital in January 428, organised by the archbishop Proclus, see Holum 1982, 184–5, Croke 1995, 82–3.

94 Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II, went to Jerusalem initially in 438, returning the following year with some relics of the protomartyr Stephen: see Holum 1982, 184–9. In 441/2, however, she was exiled and spent the rest of her life in Palestine, where she continued to support the anti-Chalcedonian cause even after Theodosius' death. See Holum 1982, 193. She died in October 460, *ibid.* 224. See also *PLRE* ii, Aelia Eudocia 2, Croke 1995, 87, Horn 2004 and PZ iii n.125.

95 The Vandal ruler Geiseric (*PLRE* ii, 496–9), who seized Carthage in October 439. See (e.g.) Stein 1959, 324–5, Moorhead 2001, 50, Mitchell 2007, 112–13.

96 Croke 1995, 85, suggests emending Areobindus to Arnegisclus, since Marc. *com.* a.441.2 states that 'John, a Vandal and Master of the Soldiery, was killed in Thrace through the treachery of Arnegisclus' (tr. Croke), referring almost certainly to this episode. He also discusses the political background to John's death, perhaps linked to Hunnic pressure. See further *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 13, Ariobindus 2, Arnegisclus.

97 Probably the earthquake of January 447 that hit Constantinople particularly hard: see Croke 1995, 88.

98 In a horse-riding accident in July 450.

**THE CHRONICLE
OF PSEUDO-ZACHARIAH RHETOR**

BOOK THREE

a. [144] The beginning of Book Three, recounted according to the writings of the believing man Zachariah, which he wrote down in Greek to one Eupraxius by name, an attendant engaged in the service of the emperor.¹ We have clearly copied down in these following twelve accounts and in their respective chapters what took place at the council that was assembled after the death of Theodosius [II] during the days of Marcian at Chalcedon in the year 764 according to the reckoning of the Greeks [A.D. 452/3]; [and concerning] the 567 bishops² [who were assembled there] through the exhortation and the letter of Leo [the bishop of] Rome that was [sent] to the emperor and [to] his wife Pulcheria.³ [This is the same council] that

1 Eupraxius was a *cubicularius* during the reign of Anastasius. The recipient of several theological letters from Severus of Antioch (*Coll., epp.* 65–8, *PO* 14 [1919], 6–75), he is also mentioned in Zach.'s *V. Sev.* 104, 106 as a supporter of the patriarch during his visit to Constantinople (508–11) and even as a dedicatee of one of his theological treatises; from Zach.'s first mention of him in this work it appears that he was already dead by the time of its composition. See AK xxii, *PLRE* ii, Eupraxius, Blaudeau 2006a, 336, 558.

2 PZ ii.5 (143) repeats this figure, also drawn from Zach.; PD i, 224/167, has the same figure, which may come from PZ, either directly or through John of Ephesus: see Witakowski 1996b, 206, cf. idem 1991, 255). *Chr.* 846, 212/162, offers the same total because it clearly derives from PZ. The *Acts Chalc.* give various estimates, from 600 (IV.53, *ACO* ii.1.2, p.113) to 457, taking as a basis the lists of signatories preserved in various languages (VI.6, *ACO* ii.1.2, pp.141–55). On this point, see Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 193–6, suggesting that the real number of bishops present was in the order of 370, cf. Ste. Croix 2006, 298 n.96. Among later sources, Mal. 14.30 has 630, *Hist. Diosc.* 293 has 634, Joh. Nik. 87.42 has 645 (but the reading is uncertain), Mich. Syr. viii.9 (185c/36) has 704, while Barheb. *CE* has 636 (twice the number present at Nicaea, for which see Schwartz 1927a, 205–6, noting that Timothy Aelurus [*PO* 13 (1913), 205] gives the same figure). See also AK 300. Some subsequently argued that this council had a special status precisely because of the unprecedented number of bishops who attended: see Blaudeau 2006a, 390 n.53 with Julian of Cos, *ep.* 33 in *ACO* ii.5 (p.66.31–3).

3 The initiative in fact came from Marcian, rather than Leo, as is clear from the former's letter to the latter (after 25 August 450), *Acts Chalc.*, Documents Before the Council (2), p.93, *ACO* ii.1.1 (pp.8–9, cf. *ACO* ii.3, p.18 in Latin), Documents Before the Council (5), pp.96–8, *ACO* ii.4 (p.41), Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 89–90, Blaudeau 2006a, 123, Price 2009a, 72–3.

banished Dioscorus [the bishop of] Alexandria to Gangra in Thrace⁴ and made Proterius [bishop] in his place, and that accepted the letter that is called the Tome of Leo. [This book also recounts] the rest of the events that took place in Jerusalem, in Alexandria, and in other places during Marcian's reign,⁵ which was six and a half years.

b.⁶ The first chapter relates those things that happened at the Council of Chalcedon up to the address of Emperor Marcian [which he delivered] to the bishops who were present. The second chapter explains the exile of Dioscorus to Gangra, the ordination of Proterius in his place, and the [events] that took place in Alexandria upon [Proterius'] arrival. The third chapter explains those [events] [145] that occurred in Palestine because of Juvenal [the bishop] of Jerusalem, who, when he broke his promises, separated from Dioscorus and assented to the Council. After the citizens of Jerusalem and the monks of Palestine learned of this, they made one Theodosius [bishop] in his place, a monk who in [his] zeal followed the [proceedings of the] Council and who, when he arrived [back] in Palestine, made known what had happened at Chalcedon. The fourth chapter takes up [the story of] the hostage⁷ Peter, a miracle[-worker], the son of the king of Iberia, who was seized by the people of Gaza and brought to Theodosius of Jerusalem who made him their bishop. The fifth chapter makes known the flight of Theodosius of Jerusalem from the threats of the emperor, and [also gives information] concerning Juvenal, who returned to Jerusalem with an army, and the many who were killed upon his arrival. The sixth chapter tells the story of a certain blind Samaritan who rubbed himself with the blood of those who had been killed and whose eyes were opened. The seventh chapter relates that Christ appeared in a vision to Peter the Iberian [the bishop] of Gaza, and told him to depart so that he should also be voluntarily driven out. The eighth chapter concerns a monk, Solomon, who contrived to enter before Juvenal of Jerusalem, pour out a full basket of dust on his head, and rebuke him. The ninth chapter concerns Theodosius of Jerusalem, who was arrested and imprisoned in a room containing lime, where his days

Whitby 2009, 182, goes so far as to state that 'Chalcedon needs to be seen as a council whose key decisions had been determined in advance by Marcian and Pulcheria', cf. Ste. Croix 2006, 279. Zach. may here be seeking to deflect the blame from Marcian for the council, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 614.

4 Perhaps this is an error of PZ or the author of this summary, since Gangra is in fact in Paphlagonia in Asia Minor, cf. e.g. *ODB* 821.

5 Syr. 'life'.

6 Comments on details in the summary here will be made in the actual chapters below.

7 Syr. *hmyr* 'Gk. *homēros*.

ended. The tenth chapter makes known the heresy of John the Rhetor from Alexandria, who was anathematised by Timothy of Alexandria, the one who became bishop after [Proterius]. The eleventh chapter is about the embassy of the *silentarius* John who was sent by the Emperor to Alexandria. The twelfth chapter concerns [146] Anthemius, Severus, Olybrius, and Leo the Younger, and what took place in the seven-year span of their reigns. The thirteenth account⁸ concerns the reign of Marcian, the assembly of bishops that came to Chalcedon, and the [events] that occurred during the assembly [at Chalcedon] up to the address of the emperor to the bishops.⁹

a. The first chapter of this book makes known the [events] that happened at the Council according to the account of one Zachariah by name, who begins to write in Greek to Eupraxius as follows.

Since it is acceptable to you and desired by you, Christ-loving Eupraxius, [who are] dwelling in the palace and occupied in the service of the emperor, to learn what happened to the holy church of God during the reign of Marcian, and [to know] the succession of the chief priests in Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem¹⁰ since the time of the assembly that took place in Chalcedon, [that council] which [was assembled] as though concerning the matter of Eutyches, but introduced and increased the heresy of Nestorius¹¹ and disturbed the whole Empire, added

⁸ Syr. *sharba* rather than the usual *risha* for chapter. See the next note.

⁹ This seems to be a garbled reference to the first part of the following chapter since this discusses the background to and opening of the Council of Chalcedon. Allen 1981, 115, and 1980, 485 n.2, noting the oddness of the term 'book' (see previous note) argues that this is a reference to a (now lost) summary of the proceedings of the council, of the type produced by Evagr. at the end of his book ii, but see n.54 below. Allen 1981, 116, points out that anti-Chalcedonian sources generally covered the council, like Zach., only up to Marcian's address, i.e. up to *Actio* VI, since these were the parts that reported the downfall of Dioscorus and the definition of faith with which they disagreed.

¹⁰ At the end of books ii-iv and vi PZ includes a list of bishops and, in some cases, secular rulers; a comparable list is also to be found at vii.15 which implies, as AK xxxii argue, that PZ may have drawn his lists from a source other than Zach. (as must be the case for that at vii.15 and viii.6). See the introduction, C (3)(iii).

¹¹ In 448 the elderly Constantinopolitan archimandrite Eutyches had been accused by bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum of heretical teachings, in particular of denying the two natures, human and divine, of Christ, such was the emphasis he placed on the divine nature at the expense of the human; his views came close to those of the fourth-century heretic Apollinarius, who 'denied the presence of a human mind or soul in Christ' (*ODCC*, 86). It is worth noting that although some of his followers may subsequently have gone this far, it is likely that Eutyches himself was merely an over-zealous supporter of Cyril of Alexandria, so Dragnet 1931, 451-7,

evil upon evil, established these two heresies side by side,¹² filled the world with divisions, overturned the tradition of the faith of the apostles and the good order of the church, and tore into myriad divisions the perfect robe of Christ¹³ woven from above, you have therefore compelled us to recount [this] history, and in so doing to condemn those two heresies, as well as every disgraceful and fraudulent teaching that stands against the church of God and against the orthodox faith of the three holy councils that have [147] accurately kept the true teaching.¹⁴

b. After the holy Cyril of Alexandria passed away,¹⁵ [he] who did battle against many fraudulent teachings and refuted them, Dioscorus received

(more strongly) Bevan and Gray 2008, 644–9. He was condemned by the Home Synod of Constantinople later that year, but in 449 the Second Council of Ephesus, later condemned as the ‘Brigandage of Ephesus’, upheld Eutyches’ views and deposed both Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, and Eusebius for violating the decisions of earlier councils in condemning Eutyches; the council likewise condemned the proceedings at Constantinople that had targeted Eutyches. See Camelot 1953, 237–42, Frend 1972, 29–44, Chadwick 2001, 553–64, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 25–33, 115–16, Gwynn 2009, 13–14. For a partial English translation of the Syriac acts of the Second Council of Ephesus, see Doran 2006, 132–88, cf. Millar 2009, Price 2009a, 71–2. The new council at Chalcedon therefore was to re-examine this issue, as PZ says. Opponents of Chalcedon generally accused the supporters of the council of being Nestorians on the grounds that both groups emphasised the dual nature of Christ. Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, 428–31, preferred to avoid the term ‘Mother of God’ or ‘God-bearer’ (Theotokos) for Mary, since he wished to distinguish carefully the natures of the human born of Mary and God himself. See Camelot 1951, 219–21, Anastos 1962, esp. 135–40, Price 2009a, 70, Neil 2009, 35–6. The First Council of Ephesus in 431, at which Cyril of Alexandria gained the upper hand, decisively rejected his teachings – or what were commonly regarded as his teachings – which led to his deposition and exile. See Frend 1972, 18–20, Young 1983, 229–40, Chadwick 2001, 527–37, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 18–23, Bevan 2007, 39–40, and n.33 below. Although Cyril was obliged to moderate his stance in the aftermath of the council, culminating in the Formula of Reunion of 433, he continued to attack those who seemed to him to call into question the unity of Christ’s nature: see Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 23–5, Doran 2006, 111–15, Clayton 2007, 207–13, Price 2009c, 124–9.

12 I.e. the dyophysite heresy (labelled ‘Nestorianism’) approved at Chalcedon (in the eyes of the Miaphysites) and the Eutychian heresy. Zach. is at pains to counteract both tendencies throughout his work, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 586–7, Introduction B (3)(ii).

13 John 19.23–4; on which see Aubineau 1971, 20–6 and Whitby 2000a, 9 n.16.

14 A reference probably to the councils of Nicaea (318), Constantinople (381) and Ephesus (431), but anti-Chalcedonians sometimes eliminated Constantinople from the list, replacing it with Ephesus II (449). Gwynn 2009, 14, 18, notes that at Ephesus II only two previous councils were acknowledged, viz. Nicaea and Ephesus I.

15 Cyril became patriarch on 18 October 412 and died on 27 June 444. On his life and voluminous works see Young 1983, 240–65, Russell 2000, 1–63, Chadwick 2001, 524–7, Russell 2003 (on his legacy). On his christology see (e.g.) Wickham 1983, xxxi–xxxv, McGuckin 1994, ch.3, Weinandy 2003.

the throne as his successor.¹⁶ [He was] a serene man and a champion, even if he did not have the same readiness or boldness [of speech] as Cyril.¹⁷ At this time, when Theodoret¹⁸ and Hiba¹⁹ had been deposed, along with Flavian of Constantinople²⁰ and Eusebius²¹ at the second council that had assembled in Ephesus in the days of Theodosius [II] [not only] on account

16 Dioscorus had previously been Cyril's archdeacon: see Frend 1972, 25.

17 Modern assessments of Dioscorus are not usually so generous: see (e.g.) Frend 1972, 26–8, although Ste. Croix 2006, 314–15 is more positive, so also Price 2009a, 77–8; cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 43 (for positive views), 98 (negative, citing Ameli's description of the patriarch as the 'Attila of the East'), MacMullen 2006, 84–95 (more interested in procedure). For a full consideration see W. Abuliff, *ESCO*, 702–11.

18 Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus (433–c.466), like Hiba, was a leading representative of what is known as the Antiochene school of Christology (a term criticised, however, by Louth 2009, 109–10, cf. Grillmeier ii.3, 227–45), which emphasised the dual nature of Christ, human and divine. Like Hiba, he was a harsh critic of Cyril's teachings, regarding them as heretical; his *ep.*151 (ed. Azéma, vol.4, *ep.*4), to the Syrian monks, roundly condemned the Twelve Anathemas of Cyril; cf. his point-by-point refutation of the same work in *ACO* i.1.6 (pp.108–46), translated in Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 173–87. He was accordingly deposed at the Second Council of Ephesus in 449 but rehabilitated, albeit with little enthusiasm, at Chalcedon in 451. See Frend 1972, 26–7, Young 1983, 265–89, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 35–6, ii, 250–2, Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 20–3, Price 2009c, 121–2.

19 Hiba (for Yehiba; Gk. Ibas), bishop of Edessa from 435 to 458, was 'a tactlessly outspoken adherent of the two-nature Christology and a disciple of Diodore [of Tarsus] and Theodore [of Mopsuestia]' (Frend 1972, 34), who had expressed harsh criticism of Cyril's views, notably in an alleged letter to Mari the Persian (see n.24 below); for a more nuanced interpretation see Rammelt 2008, 230–4. Earlier enquiries into his orthodoxy before the Second Council of Ephesus had vindicated him, but in the wake of a large-scale investigation he was deposed at the second and so-called 'Robber Council' of Ephesus in 449. See Doran 2006, 109–18, Rammelt 2008, 111–229, esp. 212–29, cf. Millar 2009, 63–4 for a useful chronology. He was subsequently restored to his see at the Council of Chalcedon, but his rehabilitation proved to be a source of continuing hostility among the anti-Chalcedonians long after his death, prompting Justinian to insist that the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 condemn his letter to Mari as unorthodox. See Samuel 1977, 83–6, Gray 1979, 64–70, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 34–5, Rammelt 2008, 274–89, Price 2009c, 120–4, *Acts Eph. II*, 14–68, cf. *Acts Chalc. IX-X* (*ACO* ii.1.3, pp.11–42) with Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 265–73 and Price 2009a, 85–7.

20 Patriarch of Constantinople, 446–9, who ordered an investigation into the teachings of Eutyches in Constantinople in 448 leading to his condemnation in the same year. He was caught up in violent scenes at Ephesus II, declared deposed, exiled, and died soon afterwards. See Chadwick 1955 (placing his death in February 450, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 291 n.193), Frend 1972, 42–3, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 25–6, 32–3.

21 Eusebius, bishop of Dorylaeum in 448, had been the chief accuser of Nestorius on the charge of heresy at the First Council of Ephesus in 433. In 448 he was the prime mover of the investigation conducted into the views of Eutyches and was therefore condemned and deposed at Ephesus II. See Frend 1972, 32, 41–2, *ODCC*, 575–6, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 25–33.

of Eutyches and Flavian,²² [but also] because of what Theodoret of Cyrrhus had written [in his] refutation of the twelve chapters that Cyril [had written] against Nestorius,²³ [on account of] the letter of Hiba of Edessa [that he had addressed to] Mari of Nisibis [in which] he rebuked Cyril,²⁴ [and because] both of them [i.e. Theodoret and Hiba] were supporting the teaching of Theodore and Diodore,²⁵ Theodoret went up to Leo [the bishop of Rome] and informed him of all of these matters.²⁶ With a bribe that blinds *the*

22 I.e. the Second Council of Ephesus on which see Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 30–7. Its acts are preserved in part in Syriac: see Flemming 1917 (edition and German translation) and Doran 2006, 133–88 (English tr.), cf. Perry 1881 for an earlier English tr. Some sections are preserved in the records of Chalcedon, at which the decisions of Ephesus II were scrutinised and overturned.

23 See n.18 above on the work concerned. The original anathemas (or chapters) may be found in *ACO* i.1, pp.40–2; Cyril subsequently offered a detailed defence of them, text in *ACO* i.1.5 (pp.15–25), tr. in McGuckin 1994, 282–93 and Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 172–87, cf. Wickham 1983, 13–33 and the discussions in Wickham 1983, xxxv–xli, Clayton 2007, 35–53. Price 2009c, 117–19 argues (cf. Gray 1997, 199–200, Chadwick 2001, 531–5) that it was not altogether clear whether the first Council of Ephesus had approved Cyril's twelve anathemas, but cf. Diepen 1955, 319–25 (arguing that it did).

24 For a translation of this letter (of 433 probably) see Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 295–8 (= *Acts Chalc.* X.138, *ACO* ii.1.3, pp.32–4) with their comments at ii, 270–3. Doran 2006, 169–73, offers a translation of the Syriac letter, which, as Millar 2009, 61, notes, was probably a retranslation into Syriac from Greek of a letter originally in Syriac. Mari may have been archimandrite of the monastery of the Akoimetai near Constantinople: see Doran 2006, 131, with van Esbroeck 1987, 133–5. The many aspects of this letter are discussed in Rammelt 2008, 62–110.

25 Theodore was bishop of Mopsuestia from 392 to 428, Diodore of Tarsus from 378 to 390. Both emphasised the two distinct natures of Christ, human and divine, united in one person. On the christologies of Theodore and Diodore, see McLeod 1999; on Theodore of Mopsuestia, McLeod 2005. For selected texts of Theodore of Mopsuestia with introduction, see McLeod 2009. They were regarded as arch-heretics among the Miaphysites: Cyril of Alexandria claimed that Diodore was responsible for Nestorius' teachings, although these statements in the letters of Cyril may be later additions. Indeed, it is most probable that it was through Rabbula that Cyril first became aware of the connections between Nestorius, Diodore, and Theodore: see Horn and Phenix 2010. Cyril's references may be found in *ACO* i.1.6, p.152, *ep.* 1 to Succensus, tr. in Wickham 1983, §3, p.73, McGuckin 1994, §3, p.353, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 45 (p.97) for the same allegation. See Frend 1972, 13–14, Young 1983, 199–213, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 60–2. See also Price 2009c, 125–7, on Cyril's efforts to condemn them and their writings in the 430s.

26 There is no evidence that Theodoret visited Rome, although Samuel 1977, 40 n.182, is partisan enough to be prepared to credit the story; he did, however, dispatch a letter to Leo, *ep.* 113 (ed. Azéma, vol.3, 56–66, in September or October 449) on which see Young 1983, 270. At the start of the letter he indeed speaks of hastening to the papal throne to gain redress, but naturally in a metaphorical sense. Cf. Leont. *Test.* 1889B–1892C with Gray 2006, 22, on

*eyes of the wise, as it is said,*²⁷ [or] *rather*²⁸ the eyes of the soul of *all who are carried away by it and by seductive words*, he subjugated him, and anger against Dioscorus and against the rest of the true bishops filled [Leo], whereupon he composed the letter²⁹ that is known as the Tome, and as though writing to Flavian against the teaching of Eutyches, Leo wrote to [148] warmly commend Theodoret to Emperor Marcian and to his wife Pulcheria.³⁰

c. Having favoured the teaching of Nestorius and having become

accusations of bribery at Chalcedon. The story of bribery is evidently a Miaphysite fiction, to be found also in PD i, 224/166, referring to Theodoret, Flavian and Hiba and Daniel of Carrhae; see n.28 below. Eusebius of Dorylaeum did visit Rome, on the other hand, after being deposed: see Chadwick 2001, 566.

27 Deuteronomy 16.19.

28 The italicised sections were added to PZT from Mich. Syr. viii.10 (185a/37). See van Ginkel 1995, 63–4. PD i, 224/166, also offers a more detailed version of this section. Van Ginkel therefore posits that a fragment of John of Ephesus may lie behind all three accounts, cf. Witakowski 1996b, 204 and p.28 above.

29 At this point in MS V (see PZT i, 147) begins a fragment with the title: ‘After the death of Nestorius.’ It continues: ‘After the death of the believing king Theodosius [III] Marcian reigned after him, and he commanded the council to assemble in accordance with the insistence of Leo of Rome and Pulcheria his wife. The 564 bishops met in Chalcedon in the year 764 of the era of Alexander of Macedon, including Leo; Theodoret of Cyrrhus went up and seized it (i.e. took control of the council).’ Clearly, in condensing the version given above, the scribe has garbled some elements, in particular in supposing Leo to have attended Chalcedon. See van Ginkel 1995, 64–5, for a detailed discussion, suggesting that fragments of John of Ephesus may lie behind this section; cf. the preceding note.

30 The famous Tome of Leo, which is indeed cast as a letter to Flavian, dated 13 June 449; its aim was to bolster Flavian’s position at Ephesus II, where, however, it was sidelined. See Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 29–30, Green 2008, 202–4. A translation of the Latin text may be found in CCC, 336–44, as also in Neil 2009, 96–103. The Greek version, ACO ii.1.1, pp.10–20, is translated in Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 14–24. A partial Syriac translation exists in BL Add. 12,156, a sixth-century manuscript, in which it is juxtaposed with refutations by Timothy Aelurus; see Ebied and Wickham 1970, 323 and Mouterde 1932, esp. 127–8. It was read out at Chalcedon at the second session (II.22) and was instrumental in establishing the two-nature Christology at the council. It stresses the two distinct natures of Christ, a feature associated convincingly by Green 2008, 206–26 with a desire to reject the views of both Nestorius and Eutyches: Leo, whose understanding of their views was limited, regarded them as accepting only one nature in Christ. The (over)-emphasis on the two separate natures thus rendered it unacceptable to the Miaphysites, cf. *ibid.*, 227–9, Bevan 2007, 39. More generally see also Uthemann 2001. On the links between Leo and Theodoret see n.26 above.

Blaudeau 2006a, 588 n.37, argues that Zach. originally criticised Marcian and Pulcheria harshly in this section, basing himself on Evagr. ii.1 and Mich. Syr. viii.10 (186/38), cf. Burgess 1993/4, 51. Certainly Mich. Syr. follows PZ fairly closely here, but includes details on pope Leo and Pulcheria in particular that are not to be found in PZ.

inclined towards it, [Marcian] sent the tribune³¹ John³² to recall from exile³³ at Oasis³⁴ Nestorius and the bishop Dorotheus who was with him [and who was] a fellow citizen of Marcianopolis.³⁵ It happened that as [Nestorius] was coming back he derided the Holy Virgin, the Birthgiver of God, saying, ‘What, Mary? Why should you be called henceforth the Birthgiver of God?’ whereupon the righteous judgment of God immediately caught up with him, just as had happened earlier to Arius who blasphemed against the Son of God. [Nestorius] suddenly fell from his mule, and his tongue was cut off, and his mouth became corrupted by worms, and he died in the road.³⁶ Dorotheus who was with him also died.

31 Syr. *trybwn*, Gk. *tribounos*.

32 *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 17.

33 This recall of Nestorius is generally regarded as a Miaphysite fiction aimed at emphasising the Nestorian nature of the decisions taken at Chalcedon. It is also found in Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 33 (p.76), 36 (p.83) and Barhadbeshabba, *HE* ch.30, *PO* 9 (1913), 585–6, Philoxenus, *Letter to the Monks of Senun*, 17–21/14–17, cf. Evagr. ii.2, who explicitly refutes Zach.’s assertion that Nestorius was recalled, citing the fact that he was repeatedly anathematised at the council as proof, although this is hardly conclusive. See Whitby 2000a, 62 n.21, Steppa 2005, 149–51. Haase 1908, 188–90, following Joh. Diakr. 528 (153.1–2), suggests that the basis of the report may have been a further transfer in Nestorius’ place of exile, from Oasis, a move that precipitated his death. Ste. Croix 2006, 280–1, on the other hand, suggests that Marcian may have wanted to recall Nestorius in order to force him to toe the line adopted at the council, cf. Bevan 2007, Whitby 2009, 182, Kosiński 2007, 164–5 (who rejects the story, however).

34 I.e. the city of Ibis at the Great Oasis, west of the Nile in Upper Egypt: see Evagr. i.7 for a catalogue of Nestorius’ various places of exile, cf. Fraisse-Coué 1998a, 25 and Millar 2006, 179–82.

35 Lit. ‘Marcion’s city’; Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 33 (pp.83–4) also refers to him, claiming that he was a well-known figure and close to Marcian. BL Add. 12,156, fols.69–80, offers a collection of citations from fathers of the church in support of the anti-Chalcedonian cause and includes letters ascribed to Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis on Cyprus. One of these is addressed to a cleric of Egypt on account of ‘a certain Dorotheus, who thinks wrongly’, of which certain fragments (52–6) are cited. A letter of Cyril to pope Celestine claims that Dorotheus, like Nestorius, had denied to Mary the epithet Theotokos, i.e. God-bearer, see *ACO* i.1.5, p.11.6–10. See Rucker 1933, 41–2, AK 303. Dorotheus was deposed soon after the Council of Ephesus in 431 by Maximian, patriarch of Constantinople, and banished to Caesarea in Cappadocia by Theodosius. A few of his letters survive. See A. van Roey, *DHGE* XIV (1960), 688. According to Barhadbeshabba, *HE* ch.30, *PO* 9 (1911), 583, he died just before Nestorius.

36 This grim and implausible fate is also reported by Mich. Syr. viii.10 (186/38), Joh. Ruf., *Pleroph.* 33 (p.76), 36 (p.84, derived from a history composed by the patriarch Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria), *Chr.* 846, 212/162 (derived from PZ), Theoph. 92.3–5. Blaudeau 2006a, 532 n.194, suggests that PZ here expanded on Zach.’s account. See also Evagr. i.7, who gives similar details, with Whitby 2000a, 21 n.64, 25 n.77; he appears to have obtained his information not from Zach., as often, but perhaps from Timothy Aelurus. The putrified tongue

d. When the emperor learned of this he became disheartened; he contemplated those things that had taken place and was cast into doubt. However, instructions from Emperor Marcian were given by the tribune John to Dioscorus and Juvenal, which summoned them to be assembled, and John informed them concerning what had happened to Nestorius and Dorotheus. While the bishops who had been called from every place were at first preparing to assemble in Nicaea, Providence³⁷ did not allow them, so that [149] Nicaea not become a rendez-vous for rebels, and so the emperor changed his mind and commanded [them] to assemble at Chalcedon.³⁸ The members of the party of Nestorius then urged on the emperor, earnestly advising him that Theodoret should stand at the head of the council and that every matter should be decided at [the council] according to his word.³⁹ When they had assembled at Chalcedon,⁴⁰ Theodoret entered and went about there boldly, as though he were an honourable bishop, he whom they had only recently deposed from the priesthood.⁴¹ Dioscorus and certain

was felt to be an appropriate end for a heretic, cf. PZ ix.19e, where a comparable fate is ascribed to pope Agapetus. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 1 (p.12) reports that Peter the Iberian told how Nestorius was likewise struck down, albeit not fatally, when preaching against Mary in Constantinople.

37 Syr. *prmw*", Gk. *pronoia*.

38 In fact, Marcian moved the council to Chalcedon, across the Bosphorus from Constantinople, in order better to follow and influence proceedings while dealing with governmental business in the capital, notably the pressure being exerted by the Huns in the Balkans following his refusal to continue paying the subsidies granted by Theodosius II to Attila. See Thompson 1999, 156–7, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 39–40, Ste. Croix 2006, 279–80 (drawing attention to the great efforts deployed by the government to ensure control of the proceedings). Whitby 2000a, 62 n.20, cf. Ste. Croix 2006, 279, suggests that disturbances at Nicaea may also have prompted the emperor to change the venue.

From Evagr.'s lengthy praise of Chalcedon and the shrine of St Euphemia (ii.3), Blaudeau 2006a, 596, infers plausibly that Zach. was critical of the council's location.

39 Mich. Syr. viii.10 (187/39) ceases to rely on PZ at this point, turning instead to a version of the *Acts Chalc.* See Mousterde 1951, 583, van Ginkel 1995, 64 n.122. Price 2009b, 95, notes the pressure exerted by the emperor on the bishops to revise their definition of the faith, cf. Whitby 2009, 181.

40 For detailed discussion of the council and its decisions see Grillmeier and Bacht 1951–3, Samuel 1977, 44–88, Grillmeier i, 751–75/541–57, Meyendorff 1989, 165–87, Maraval 1998a, Chadwick 2001, 570–87, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 37–51, 56–75, Price 2009a.

41 Pope Leo had protested at the deposition of Theodoret at Ephesus II and he had therefore been allowed to return to his see by Marcian. He was indeed present at Chalcedon, much to the annoyance of the Egyptian bishops, as their acclamations make clear (e.g. *Acts Chalc.* I.27, 37, ACO ii.1.1, pp.69–70). Already at the first session he was seated apart from the other bishops as one of the accusers (of Dioscorus and others), I.35, ACO ii.1.1, p.70. Despite this, it was not until the eighth session that he was formally restored to his see. See Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 134 n.64, ii, 250–1.

bishops became agitated and upset because of the haughtiness that this man possessed, but they were unable to stop [it] because of the imperial authority [that Theodoret enjoyed],⁴² while seeing that the canons were being despised by him and by Hiba, with the help of the representatives of Leo from Rome.⁴³

e. While Dioscorus was proclaiming at the council the teaching of faith, and with him were Juvenal,⁴⁴ Thalassius of Cappadocia,⁴⁵ Anatolius,⁴⁶

42 See *Acts Chalc.* I.35 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.70), at which Theodoret was presented as an accuser by 'the most glorious officials and the exalted Senate', thus confirming the backing he enjoyed. Although Gray 1979, 8, points out that he was not involved in drafting any of the definitions of faith at the council, his influence was nevertheless considerable: see Price 2009a, 79, Ste. Croix 2006, 291–303.

43 Pope Leo was represented by bishops Paschasius of Lilybaeum (Sicily), Lucentius of Asculanum, and Julian of Cos, as well as the presbyter Boniface. See Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 42.

44 Bishop of Jerusalem, 422–58, and at Ephesus II among the leading supporters of Dioscorus. He was to perform a spectacular volte-face at Chalcedon, thus ensuring that he maintained his position. See Honigmann 1950, 233–47, Frend 1972, 47, *Acts Chalc.* I.283–4 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.115). Juvenal, Thalassius, Eusebius, Eustathius (all here named) and Basil, bishop of Seleucia in Isauria, and, of course, Dioscorus, were all deposed at the close of the first session at Chalcedon, *Acts Chalc.* I.1068 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.195), because of their central role in the irregular deposition of Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylaeum. With the exception of Dioscorus, all were reinstated by Marcian at the assembled bishops' request (*Acts Chalc.* IV.12–18, *ACO* ii.1.2, pp.109–10). See Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 119.

45 Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 440–51, cf. *HEO*, 21. Like Juvenal, he had been a close ally of Dioscorus at Ephesus II, see Frend 1972, 39; he was more successful, however, in distancing himself from his earlier role, see *Acts Chalc.* I.61 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.61) with Honigmann 1950, 241. He too accepted the decisions of Chalcedon and even backed the restoration of Theodoret to his see, *Acts Chalc.* VIII.20 (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.10). His see was one of the most important of the eastern empire, as is clear from the prominence accorded it at *Acts Chalc.* I.4 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.64–5), where he is noted as sitting at the front of the Church of St Euphemia, along with the patriarchs, cf. I.3 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.56). He appears to have died before returning to Caesarea after the council. His successor Alypius, on the other hand, affirmed that he was unaware of the decisions taken at the council, *ACO* ii.5, p.76.5–22.

46 Successor of Flavian as Patriarch of Constantinople (449/50–458) and the former *apocrisiarius* of Dioscorus in Constantinople. Despite this attachment, Anatolius was a zealous defender of the interests of the Constantinopolitan see and astutely collaborated with the Empress Pulcheria and pope Leo before and during the Council of Chalcedon. See Chadwick 1955, 26–34 (noting that, depending on the date accepted for his succession, he may even have had a hand in the death of his predecessor), Frend 1972, 43–7.

Amphilochius of Side,⁴⁷ Eusebius of Ancyra⁴⁸ and Eustathius of Beirut,⁴⁹ [it happened] as though by a miracle [that] Eusebius of Dorylaeum⁵⁰ came to agree with those who saw that the teaching of Nestorius, [that there were] two natures [of Christ], was becoming accepted and established through the cooperation of John of Germanicia.⁵¹ During the debate that [took place] there, this [man] was fiercely contending against those who said, ‘It is right for us to confess Christ [having] one incarnate nature from two [natures], like the rest of the fathers, and not to invent something that is alien and to impose it on the faith.’⁵² On account of these [men], John of Germanicia and

47 Bishop of Side in Pamphylia, 426 (or earlier) – 458 (or later), cf. R. Janin, *DHGE* II (1914), 1348, di Berardino 2006, 27–8. In 457 he was the only metropolitan bishop to respond to Leo’s Encyclical by condemning Chalcedon and thus was clearly to some degree aligned with the Miaphysites; see Evagr. ii.10, Frend 1972, 162. He had also expressed reservations about the condemnation of Dioscorus, *Acts Chalc.* III.29, 96.22 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.12, ii.3.2, p.50 [Latin]). This would also explain why at Chalcedon, following the rehabilitation of Theodoret, the assembled bishops insist that he anathematise Eutyches, *Acts Chalc.* VIII.30–1 (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.11). See Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 218 n.26: it is clear from *Acts Chalc.* VI.9.21 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.142), where his name is omitted in the Greek version of the Acts, that he only reluctantly approved of the decisions of Chalcedon. His record is, however, somewhat ambiguous: see further nn.61, 83 below.

48 Bishop of Ancyra, before 446 – 451 or later, cf. *HEO*, 55. At Ephesus II he was a supporter of Dioscorus (see e.g. *Acts Chalc.* I.884.5 (from *Acts Eph. II*), *ACO* ii.1.1, pp.182–3) but in general was more in sympathy with the dyophysites: he condemned Eutyches in 448 and was a correspondent of Theodoret of Cyrrhus. See R. Aubert, *DHGE* XV (1963), 1434.

49 Bishop of Beirut (Berytus), before 448 – 451 or later, cf. *HEO*, 712. A supporter of Dioscorus at Ephesus II, he had been rewarded by the elevation of his see to metropolitan status in late 449 or early 450, which led in turn to conflicts with the bishop of Tyre, Photius. At Chalcedon, a particular session was devoted to the resolution of this dispute, as to who had the right to consecrate bishops in certain cities in Phoenicia, and Eustathius was obliged to give ground. See *Acts Chalc.* Session on Photius and Eustathius (*ACO* ii.1.3, pp.101–10) with Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 169–70. At the first session Eustathius, while seeking to remain faithful to Cyril’s one-nature teachings, admitted his error in deposing Flavian, *Acts Chalc.* I.267–9, cf. 531 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.113, 143). See A. van Roey, *DHGE* XVI (1967), 23, di Berardino 2006, 184–5.

50 On whom see n.21 above.

51 Bishop of Germanicia in Euphratesia (for an unknown term, cf. *HEO*, 789). An associate of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, whose suspected Nestorian leanings led him to be called upon to anathematise Nestorius at *Acts Chalc.* VIII.28–9 (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.11), cf. V.12 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.123–4), and see D. and L. Stiennon, *DHGE* XX (1984), 952–3. PZ seems to overestimate John’s influence at the council, since at the fifth session his objections do not seem to have attracted any support, *Acts Chalc.* V.4, 12 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.123–4). See Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 185. Nor do the *Acts Chalc.* record any consensus among the bishops mentioned during the debate on doctrine in Sessions II, IV, and V.

52 I.e. Eusebius would have rejected this proposition and the other named bishops in this paragraph would have accepted it.

the rest of those of like mind to Nestorius, at whose head was Theodoret, deposed Dioscorus because he had said, 'It is right for us to believe that Christ became incarnate from two natures, and it is not right [150] that we confess [that he became incarnate] in two natures after the union, like the party of Nestorius.'⁵³ Then Anatolius, the bishop of the imperial city, cried out, 'Dioscorus is not being deposed on account of the faith, but rather because he is not in communion with the chief priest, my lord Leo.'⁵⁴

f. After the shouting of many, and [after] what was spoken was recorded in the acts⁵⁵ [of the council], finally those bishops were forced to sign on to [the teaching] that our Lord Jesus Christ was in two natures. They praised the Tome of Leo and called it an orthodox monument, one which declared

53 This reflects accurately Dioscorus' position as expressed in *Acts Chalc.* I.332 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.120); the council therefore insisted on acknowledging Christ 'in two natures' rather than 'from two natures', V.26 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.125). On the tricky distinction between these positions see Galtier 1951, 358–72, Chadwick 1983, 11–15, McGuckin 1994, 230–1, Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 184–91. On Dioscorus' christology see Lebon 1909, 84–93, idem 1946, Samuel 1977, 181–6. It is likely, as Samuel argues, that although Dioscorus was prepared to accept Christ 'from two natures', he would not have agreed to the formula 'in two natures', a wording adopted partly for this reason: see *Acts Chalc.* I.332, V.26 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.120.13–15, ii.1.2, p.125.16–20).

54 The text of this passage is unclear. We have accepted the emendation proposed by Brooks (PZT i, 150 n.2) of Syr. *dlm* 'lest' to 'l' 'but.' PZ here gives an accurate report of Anatolius' declaration at the Fifth Session of Chalcedon (*Acts Chalc.* V.13, *ACO* ii.1.2, p.124.14–16), where, in the translation of Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 198, he stated: 'It was not because of the faith that Dioscorus was deposed. He was deposed because he broke off communion with the lord Archbishop Leo and was summoned a third time and did not come.' Dioscorus was condemned at the Third Session largely for these reasons (he excommunicated Leo at Nicaea shortly before the council was moved to Chalcedon, cf. *Acts Chalc.* III.47 [*ACO* ii.1.2, p.16] with Gaddis 2006, 308–9, Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 32 n.8, although Samuel 1977, 62–4, denies this), but other disciplinary grounds were also cited, along with vague charges of heresy: see Samuel 1977, 66–70, Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 30–5, Gaddis 2006, 318–21, Blaudeau 2006b, 183. Whitby in Ste. Croix 2006, 283 n.58, convincingly argues that the papal representatives, who presided over this session (alone), were instrumental in bringing down Dioscorus. As Lebon 1946, 516, and Honigmann 1950, 236, note, anti-Chalcedonians were quick to exploit this point, citing the *Acts* in their support; Allen 1981, 115–16, suggests that Zach. may have included a summary of the *Acts* in his work (like Evagr. ii.18), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 116 n.7, 566 n.382, 585, but Whitby 2000a, 100 n.153, argues that this is unlikely given that Mich. Syr. relies on other sources in his version of the proceedings, cf. idem 2003, 479–80.

55 Syr. *pṣrgmn*, Gk. *pepragmena*. Allen 1981, 114, infers from this that Zach., like Evagrius, had access to a version of the proceedings of the council. See also preceding note.

two *hypostaseis*⁵⁶ and two natures⁵⁷ [along with] their properties⁵⁸ and operations.⁵⁹ When these things [had taken place], those priests who had

56 Syr. *qnumê*, translating here Gk. *hypostaseis*. In Trinitarian theology, this same term *qnuma* means 'person,' translating Gk. *prosôpon*, but in this context *hypostasis* should be preferred, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 585 n.22.

57 Syr. *kyanê*, translating here Gk. *physeis*. This assertion is incorrect, since Chalcedon's definition (*Acts Chalc.* V.34, *ACO* ii.1.2, pp.128–30) explicitly insisted on there being two natures in the one person (and *hypostasis*) of Christ. See Perrone 1996, 430–41, Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 68–71, Price 2009a, 81, cf. Young 1983, 237–8, noting confusion in Nestorius' own discussions of the matter. From (e.g.) Marcian's letter to the archimandrites of Jerusalem, *ACO* ii.1.3, p.126.32 (tr. in *RSCC*, 836) it is clear that anti-Chalcedonians regularly asserted that the council had proclaimed two Christs and two sons, cf. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 182. As modern scholars have pointed out, Chalcedon's definition could be seen as in line with Cyril's teachings: see Gray 1979, 7–16, McGuckin 1994, 234–5, Weinandy 2003, 43–4, Wessel 2004, 287–92, Gwynn 2009, 16, but cf. de Durand 2002, esp.370, and Bevan 2007, 39, for an interpretation that plays down Cyril's influence. Gray 2005, 222–3, rightly points out that Cyril's views varied over time: Chalcedon backed the Cyril of 433 against the Cyril of 431. See also n.11 above on Cyril's christology.

58 Syr. *dilyata*.

59 Syr. *ma'bedanuta*. PZ implies that a rigid distinction was drawn between Christ's two natures in Leo's Tome, a justifiable charge (*Acts Chalc.* II.22, *ACO* ii.1.1, pp.15–16). Green 2008, 217–22, attributes this tendency to a desire to counteract Eutyches' views, cf. Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 20 nn.57–8. The Chalcedonian definition likewise insisted on the properties of Christ's two natures being preserved despite the union of two natures, see *Acts Chalc.* V.34 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.129.31–3) with Anastos 1962, 135–40, Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 204, Pásztori-Kupán 2006, 39–40. Anti-Chalcedonians felt that the council had unreasonably separated Christ into two persons and thus sided with Nestorius. See Galtier 1951, 372–85, Camelot 1951, 224–5, Weinandy 2003, 47–53, McGuckin 1994, 151–7 (on Nestorius' position, separating the two natures), cf. 234, McGuckin 1995, 44–6, Steppa 2005, 152–5, Green 2008, 227–8. Cf. Anastos 1962, 124–5: for Nestorius 'there were in Christ two natures, two substances (or essences), two hypostases (which he often omits), and two prosopa', terms which he confusingly tended to use as synonyms. Blaudeau 2006a, 159 and n.317, points out that aspects of the translation of the Tome into Greek exacerbated the issue. In the end, in the face of scepticism regarding Leo's interpretation of the functioning of Christ's two natures, the parts of his Tome that dealt with them were dropped from the final definition: see Chadwick 1983, 12–13, McGuckin 1994, 237–8 with *Acts Chalc.* II.25–6 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.82) and Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 25 n.79. As they rightly point out, Dioscorus' stated views on the nature of Christ (tr. in Perry 1881, 392 (from BL Add. 12,156) do not differ greatly from those adopted by the council.

The Fifth Session of Chalcedon approved a draft definition of faith submitted to it following minor revisions by a select committee of bishops: see Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 187–91, Price 2009a, 79–81. Leo's Tome was read out in the Second Session (II.22, *ACO* ii.1.2, p.81); the *Acts* record the positive reaction it elicited among the bishops present, II.23–8 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.81–2), although there were vocal objections to it in some quarters, and checks were undertaken to ensure that it was in line with Cyril's works: see Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 3–4. At IV.8–9 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.103–9) the *Acts* record the explicit assent accorded by 158 bishops to the Tome. At the Sixth Session 457 bishops signed the definition produced: see Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 207.

a short time earlier in the days of the blessed Theodosius assembled at the second council of Ephesus [and who] had cried out many times, ‘Whoever says, “Two natures separated into two [natures after the incarnation],” cut [him] in two!’,⁶⁰ were required under coercion to sign on [to the acts of the council].⁶¹ When they reiterated to Dioscorus through John, the chief of the *silentiarii*, that he should agree to them and sign on, [thereby] receiving back his own throne,⁶² he courageously said, ‘When the blood of his severed hands would flow on the paper, no sooner would Dioscorus do this.’⁶³ With this he was driven into exile in Gangra, because the members of the party of Nestorius had reported concerning him that he was of an opinion like [that of] Eutyches.⁶⁴

g. Omitting many matters of which he spoke and wrote both to Domnus [the patriarch] of Antioch and at the council of Chalcedon itself,⁶⁵ which bear witness to the man’s faith which was like [the faith of] Athanasius, Cyril, [151] and the rest of the teachers, I think it best that I copy out a synopsis (even if it is brief) from what he wrote while in exile to Secundinus,

60 The text written over the erasure reads: ‘Let the *silentiarius* go up [to remove him]!’ See *Acts Chalc.* I.62, describing events at Ephesus (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.76), cf. PZT, i, 150 n.11 (although, *contra* Brooks, the Greek verb *temnō* is not found in the acts). The word *silentiarius* has been added from the immediately following section.

61 Lit. ‘set the hand’. The *Acts Chalc.* offer little trace of the compulsion exerted on opponents to sign, save perhaps in the omission of Amphilocheius of Side’s name in the Greek version of the acts, on which see n.47 above. See further n.87 below (on Eustathius). Ste. Croix 2006, 273–94, rightly underlines, however, the institutional constraints on participants.

62 *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 19; he was a leading *silentiarius* (a *decurio silentiariorum*) who was present at the Council. *PLRE* places this mission to Dioscorus in 453, shortly before his exile to Gangra.

63 *Hist. Diosc.* 272–3 likewise insists on the patriarch’s refusal to give ground. Barhebr. *CE* 176/7 preserves a fuller version of the same anecdote as PZ, specifying (e.g.) that the *silentarius* was called John Accudaeus.

64 Dioscorus was exiled first to Cyzicus, then to Heraclea, then in 453 to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in the following year on 4 September. See Gregory 1979, 181 with Tim Ael., *PO* 13 (1919), 210. Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 34, point out that it is far from clear that he was in agreement with Eutyches, despite the implication of some bishops at Chalcedon that he was (*Acts Chalc.* V.26–7, *ACO* ii.1.2, p.125). Discussions on this issue continued as late as 532: see *ACO* iv.2, pp.170–1 and PZ ix.15d below with Lebon 1946, 517–19, noting several anti-Chalcedonian defences of Dioscorus for having apparently given Eutyches his backing at Ephesus II. Already at *Acts Chalc.* I.168 (i.1.1, p.92) Dioscorus had showed himself willing to condemn Eutyches if his views were proved to be unorthodox, cf. Lebon 1909, 490–2.

65 *Acts Eph. II*, 132/3–142/3 (cf. Perry 1881, 327–48) for extracts from three letters from Dioscorus to Domnus, 144/5–146/7 for his reply. At Chalcedon itself Dioscorus had little opportunity to defend his own orthodoxy: he refused three summons from the council.

which stated the following.⁶⁶

h. ‘While I may omit many things that are necessary, these I shall make known. Let no one say that the holy body that our Lord took from the virgin Mary through the Holy Spirit, in a manner he [alone] knows, was different and strange [with respect] to our body. Since this is so, those who say that Christ was not embodied as [we are] make Paul into a liar, because he said, ‘Not from the angels did he take [his nature], but from the seed of the descendants of Abraham,’⁶⁷ to which Mary was no stranger, as Scripture teaches us. Moreover, ‘It was proper that he resemble his brothers in everything,’⁶⁸ and that [expression] ‘in everything’ does not exclude anything from our nature, because the animate⁶⁹ flesh of our Saviour, who was born from Mary without the seed of a man and the pleasure and lying down of sleep, with this rational and intelligent soul, consisted of tendons,⁷⁰ hair, bones, veins, stomach, heart, kidneys, liver, lungs, and in sum, of everything [by which] we are constituted.’⁷¹

i. ‘For if this did not happen, as the heretics suppose, then why is he

66 It is unknown who Secundinus was. This letter to Secundinus, *CPG* 5453, is also to be found in BL Add. 12,156, fol.33^r, a Syriac manuscript filled with anti-Chalcedonian polemic, including various works of Timothy Aelurus. In two cases he quotes from this letter of Dioscorus, once in his letter to the City of Alexandria (translated in Ebied and Wickham 1970, 360, cf. *ibid.* 324 on these two versions), and in his *Refutation of the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon*, in the same MS, fols.49^v-50^r, tr. in Ebied and Wickham 1985, 160. The letter is also quoted by PZ in his version of Timothy’s letter to Alexandria at iv.12jj. One other letter from exile is attested, to the Monks of Enaton, *CPG* 5454, also to be found in BL Add. 12,156, fols.10^v-11^r (cf. fol.50^{r-v}, tr. in Ebied and Wickham 1985, 160–1 and see Lebon 1927, 717, who notes that the full version is preserved in Armenian), tr. Perry 1881, 392–4; like the present one, it also insists on God becoming man (in Christ) through divine economy. Blaudeau 2006a, 369 and n.508, suggests that Zach. drew here on a dossier of material put together by Timothy Aelurus after his return to Alexandria in 475, which included extracts of Dioscorus’ correspondence.

67 Hebrews 2.16.

68 Hebrews 2.17.

69 Syr. *menappaša*, lit. ‘ensouled’.

70 Or ‘nerves.’

71 In Timothy’s quotation of Dioscorus the order of the last part of the sentence is reversed: ‘The phrase is “in everything”. It does not exclude any part of our nature at all. It includes nerves, hair, bones, veins, belly, heart, kidneys, liver, and lung. That flesh of our Saviour, which was born of Mary and which was ensouled with a rational soul, was constituted of every element of which we are composed, but not through male seed, sleep, and sensual gratification.’ (fol. 33^r, tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 360). Cf. Leont. *Test.* 1868A, quoting the spurious *Ep. ad Dionysium* of Julius of Rome, in fact the work of Apollinarius, for a similar consideration of the constituent parts of Christ’s human nature.

named ‘our brother’? Again, if he used a body that is alien to our own, how [then could] it be correct when he says to his Father, [152] ‘I shall make known your name to my brothers?’⁷² Should we not drive away from us and despise those who think such things? For he was like us, on account of us, and with us, not in fantasy or in semblance according to the heresy of the Manichaeans,⁷³ but rather he shone forth to us in reality, as he willed, from Mary the Birthgiver of God, and he entered the vessel that was broken so that it was renewed for us. He was declared [to be] Emmanuel, [he] who became poor for us, according to the word of Paul, ‘So that through his humility we might become rich.’⁷⁴ He became like us through the economy [of God], so that through his mercy we might become like him. He became human without destroying his nature as the Son of God, so that through grace we might become sons of God. These things I think and believe, and if anyone thinks otherwise, he is a stranger to the faith of the apostles.’

j. And although this apostolic man was familiar with this confession from the beginning of his life,⁷⁵ he was deposed and banished into exile because he did not want to worship the idol of the two faces⁷⁶ which had been erected by Leo and by the assembly of Chalcedon, and because he was not in communion with Theodoret and Hiba, those who had [earlier] been banished because of their blasphemies. The story is said that when on one occasion he saw Theodoret seated on a chair in the assembly, speaking from it and not [153] standing up and making a defence as a man who had been canonically deposed from the priesthood, [Dioscorus] stood up from [his] chair and sat on the pavement, saying, ‘I do not sit with the wicked and I do not go in with fools.’⁷⁷ With this, the members of Theodoret’s party cried out, ‘He has deposed himself!’ while the rest of the bishops cried out, ‘The faith is perishing; if Theodoret, who is of the same thought as Nestorius, is

72 Hebrews 2.12, and Peshitta Psalm 22.23 (Psalm 21[22].23).

73 A standard insult of the day which carried the implication that the person did not believe in the equality of Christ with God the Father. So Ste. Croix 2006, 302 and n.101. Here, however, it may more specifically designate those who subscribed to ‘docetist’ views, i.e. who believed that Christ only appeared to be human, cf. McGuckin 1994, 385 n.14. See also PZ vii.7b and n.129.

74 2 Corinthians 8.9. The previous section echoes Hebrews 9–10.

75 MS V fol.79r reads, ‘Dioscorus, while he had cleaved to the faith of the apostles and to this confession since the beginning of his life ...’ See PZT i, 152 n.9.

76 Syr. *appayn*, which is probably a translation of Gk. *prosôpon*, a reference to the two-nature christology accepted by Chalcedon, through a reference to Peshitta 2 Chronicles 33.7: ‘Then [Manasseh] set up the four-faced image that he had made in the house of the Lord.’

77 Psalm 25 (26).4.

accepted, then we are rejecting Cyril!’⁷⁸ Then Basil the bishop of Traianopolis⁷⁹ stood up and said, ‘It is we who deposed Theodore!’⁸⁰

k. They say that Aetius the deacon,⁸¹ who had gone by night to Theodore and made a complete copy for him of the creed⁸² of the Two Natures, gave Amphilocheus [of Side] beatings on his head so that he would sign on.⁸³ After the [Creed of the Two Natures] was accepted by the bishops, and they had agreed to it, Theodore acted insolently⁸⁴ and derided⁸⁵ them saying, ‘See, I have made them taste the leaven of the teaching of Nestorius, and they take delight in it!’⁸⁶ When Eustathius of Beirut signed, he wrote in code,⁸⁷ ‘I write these things out of compulsion; I do not agree.’ He wept

78 Cf. *Acts Chalc.* I.43, *ACO* ii.1.1, p.70.26–7, ‘Theodore accused Cyril. We exclude Cyril if we admit Theodore’, as the Egyptian bishops declared upon Theodore’s introduction to the council.

79 *Acts Chalc.* ‘Traianoupolis’, the metropolis of Rhodope in the Balkans. The manuscript (and Mich. Syr.) have Tripolis, which (following Brooks, *PZV* i, 105 n.6) we have corrected.

80 Basil attended both Ephesus II and Chalcedon. *PZ* alludes here to the First Session, *Acts Chalc.* I.34–42 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.69–70), where Theodore, having been cleared of the accusations against him, appears ‘in the role of accuser’ (I.35, *ACO* ii.1.1, p.70.3), whereupon Basil (I.42, *ACO* ii.1.1, p.70.25) stated ‘We also condemned Theodore’ (tr. Gaddis and Price).

81 Aetius was archdeacon of Constantinople and the *primicerius* of the notaries (scribes) and thus responsible for producing conciliar documents. He had been obliged to defend his minutes of the proceedings against Eutyches in 448 at Ephesus II: see *Acts Chalc.* I.767, 792 (*ACO* ii.1.1, pp.170–1, 173) with Whitby 2009, 178, cf. Ste. Croix 2006, 308. That he had no sympathy for Eutyches is clear from *Acts Chalc.* IV.98–102 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.118–19), but there is no record of him transmitting documents to Theodore in any other source.

82 Syr. *swmbln*, Gk. *symbolon*.

83 See n.61 above on Amphilocheus, cf. Chadwick 2001, 582–3 on this episode. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 85 (p.139) recounts the vision of a Pamphylian archimandrite, Epictetus, who beheld Amphilocheus and another bishop trapped in mud up to their necks. Upon being asked about his predicament, Amphilocheus explained that it was in punishment for having signed at Chalcedon. See Whitby 2009, 192–3.

84 HB 199 n.4 explain that the verb ‘*zdypn*’ means ‘to act insolently,’ and not ‘to be cunning’ as Payne Smith (and Margoliouth) have it.

85 Syr. *mlm*. See HB 42 n.5 for an explanation of this word.

86 This passage is fragmentary in V, but as in chapters two and three, there is a brief explanation: ‘Dioscorus the Confessor was sent away to live in Gangra. Juvenal, who was on his side, betrayed the faith and betrayed his oaths to the people of Jerusalem, and accepted the decision that was set down at the Council of Chalcedon. This will be made known in the narratives below ...’ See *PZT* i, 153 n.14. The *Acts Chalc.* naturally do not report any such remarks of Theodore.

87 Syr. *symyn*’ (*pl.*), Gk. *sêmeia*, ‘signs,’ following the translation of AK 305; HB 47 translate this expression, ‘in shorthand’. As AK, *loc. cit.*, note, *PZ* is here relying on anti-Chalcedonian traditions, designed to absolve Amphilocheus and Eustathius of having subscribed to the definition of faith. *Acts Chalc.* make no mention of Eustathius’ objections. See also *PZ* iv n.86

much, as did the others who proclaimed [that there had been] coercion and exposed [154] the hypocritical faith, because the leaders of the Senate⁸⁸ were occasionally present in the discussions and attended the council.⁸⁹ Finally, the emperor and Pulcheria his wife [arrived], and he gave an address in the *martyrium* of Euphemia, which follows.⁹⁰

I. ‘Since the beginning, when we were chosen and deemed worthy of the empire by God, no one matter among the concerns of public affairs has detained us, but rather we have chosen to honour the true faith of the Christians, and to accustom human souls to it in purity; all the while the array of deceitful teachings and opinions that do not agree with the proven teaching of the fathers being removed from [our] midst. Therefore we have called this holy council so that it might purge away entirely the darkness and remove the filth of [false] opinions, so that with pure thought the teaching of the faith that is in our Lord Jesus Christ may be established,’ etc. When the emperor had made [the rest of his] address with similar [words], the bishops glorified him, the Senate, and the letter of Leo, reporting concerning it that its faith agreed with that of the apostle Peter.

a. The second chapter concerns the exile of Dioscorus, the ordination of Proterius in his place, the killings that occurred upon his arrival, and the payments that he made to the soldiers⁹¹ who were helping him from the funds that were in the churches, which were intended for the poor.

on Eustathius; Evagr. ii.2 refers to a letter of his to a bishop John and another John, in which he insisted that supporters of Nestorius were expelled from the council; one may infer that he had great difficulty in justifying his subscription to the council’s definition of faith.

88 Syr. *swnqlts*, Gk. *synklêtos*.

89 PZ is correct in noting the presence of leading senators at the council, which is confirmed in the *Acts Chalc.* See Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 41 and Ste. Croix 2006, 285–94. Although the latter well demonstrates the links between Anatolius, the leading layman present at Chalcedon, and Theodore, opponents of the council believed that the majority of the aristocracy were on their side: this emerges very clearly from *Hist. Diosc.* 261, 269, 271, cf. Haase 1908, 216–17. Zach. thus mentions them here to associate them with opposition to the council.

90 A loose rendering of the first part of *Acts Chalc.* VI.2 (Latin version, *ACO* ii.3, pp.409–10, cf. ii.2, 97–8), VI.4 (Greek version, ii.1.2, pp.39–40). Pulcheria’s presence is passed over in certain sources, but, as Schwartz 1927a, 211, argues, it is not in doubt; later apologists for the council sought, however, to efface her participation.

91 Lit. ‘Romans.’ PZ refers thus to soldiers throughout, also at vii.8i, which implies that it is PZ’s term, not Zach.’s. It may here be a Syriac rendering of the Greek *stratiôtês* (soldier), for it would be unusual for a Greek source such as Zach. to refer to imperial forces in this way unless dealing with a foreign conflict. See Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 299 n.29, for Mich. Syr. distinguishing between Romans (i.e. soldiers) and residents of Mesopotamia; cf. also Chabot in Mich. Syr., vol.2, 90 n.8.

When the Council had reached such a conclusion, Dioscorus was marked [as] a confessor, and was banished to Gangra to reside [there],⁹² and in his place [155] in Alexandria was appointed Proterius, who had been a priest⁹³ with him, and had at first greatly resisted the Council, but because he wanted to snatch up the see for himself, he became a betrayer, like Judas [the betrayer of] his Lord,⁹⁴ and like Absalom [who betrayed] his father [David],⁹⁵ and he showed himself [to be] a rapacious wolf among the flock. He afflicted and abused many who were unwilling so that they would agree with him. He sent [many] into exile, and seized their property through the governors who were obedient to him by order of the Emperor [Marcian],⁹⁶ whereupon the archbishops⁹⁷, the bishops⁹⁸, monks and the multitude of the populace, when considering the faith that had been polluted, the iniquitous banishment of Dioscorus, and the impudence and cunning of Proterius, gathered themselves in monasteries and separated from him, and

92 In Paphlagonia, considered beyond the reach of contacts with Alexandria, to which Timothy Aelurus was also subsequently exiled. See PZ iv.9 and Blaudeau 2006a, 316–18 with map 4.

93 Syr. *qaššiša*, lit. ‘elder.’ The word ‘priest,’ *kahna*, is often in PZ reserved for a bishop.

94 Cf. Matthew 26.14, 25, Mark 14.10, Luke 22.4, 48.

95 Cf. 2 Samuel 15. Barheb. CE 175/6 is very close to PZ’s account here.

96 *Hist. Diosc.* 309 claims that Proterius was the first to sign the Tome (of Leo) and paid money to the hipparch (i.e. the governor) and the heretics so that they would destroy the monasteries; 999 suffered this fate, the author relates, and only seven were spared. Evagr. ii.5 claims that Proterius was elected by a vote of the synod of the Alexandrians, while Lib. *Brev.* 14/97 (ACO ii.5, p.123, translated in Gregory 1979, 181) describes how the four bishops who opposed Dioscorus returned to Alexandria, where, with the backing of the nobility and the emperor, they chose Proterius as Dioscorus’ successor (by ‘the opinion of all’), despite the wish of the people not to replace the deposed patriarch while he remained alive. PZ’s account (and others) show that he enjoyed very little support among the populace and clergy of the city; the *Acts Chalc.* IV.48–59 (ACO ii.1.2, pp.112–13) report how scared the Egyptian bishops were at the prospect of assenting to Dioscorus’ deposition, claiming that they would be killed for doing so upon returning to Egypt. See Frend 1972, 142, 149, Gregory 1979, 181–2, Whitby 2000a, 76 n.72, Russell 2003, 241–2, Blaudeau 2006a, 142–3. Proterius is likened to a wolf in *V. Petr. Iber.* 90/63 and Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 66 (p.123), cf. 68–9 (pp.124–5), which confirm, as PZ implies, that he was initially regarded as a loyal supporter of Dioscorus. The image, derived from Matthew 7.15, is a standard one in anti-Chalcedonian literature, also applied to the patriarch Calendon of Antioch at *V. Petr. Iber.* 112/81.

V. Long. ch.29–37 offers a far-fetched account of how Longinus, abbot of the Enaton monastery, and the monks under him, successfully opposed the imperial forces under the *augustalis* Acacius sent to enforce adherence to Chalcedon, cf. *Pan. Mac.* ch.9 (70–7/54–9) with Orlandi 1975, 44–5, Vivian 1999, 6–9, Watts 2010, 220–1.

97 Lit. ‘the heads of the priests’.

98 This word *kahnê* could also mean simply ‘the priests.’

proclaimed Dioscorus [bishop] and wrote his name in the Book of Life⁹⁹ as a tried and faithful priest of God.

b. Then Proterius became anxious and gave a bribe into the hands of the soldiers, armed them against the people, and filled their hands with the blood of the faithful who were killed, for they too strengthened themselves and made a war in which many died, [including] those who had fled and taken refuge at the altar and in the baptistery.¹⁰⁰

a. The third chapter makes known what happened in Palestine because of Juvenal [the bishop of] Jerusalem, who broke his promises and separated from Dioscorus. The monks and the people of Jerusalem learned [of it] from a certain monk Theodosius, who through [his] zeal was present [156] at Chalcedon. Having observed the [events that] took place there he came to Jerusalem and reported it, and they made him bishop by force instead of Juvenal.

b. In Palestine, [there] took place evils such as these and greater, the cause of which I [now] state. When Juvenal was summoned to Chalcedon and learned from the tribune John¹⁰¹ the desire of the emperor, and that Nestorius, who had been summoned to come up [from Egypt], had died while returning from exile, Juvenal, having been convinced of the absurdity of the teaching that was in the Tome that inclined to the opinion of Nestorius, called his clergy and having assembled the monks and the people exposed this deceptive teaching and condemned it, and confirmed the souls of many in the true faith. He commanded everyone to no longer be in communion

99 The Book of Life contained the names of revered fathers of the church whose names were read out on certain special occasions at the time of the sign of peace, i.e. before the diptychs (which also contained the names of fathers of the church and members of the hierarchy to be commemorated). See Connolly 1912 on Syriac evidence, Taft 1991, 71–5 and 77 (on the Egyptian context), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 457 with n.151 below.

100 See n.96 above for allegations of Proterius' depredations. Evagr. ii.5, quoting Priscus of Panium (frg.28.1), provides a vivid account of extensive rioting in Alexandria which required the prompt dispatch of 2000 soldiers to the city; see also Theoph. 106–7 (from a different source) with Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 77 (p.133). Their behaviour in the city raised tensions further, according to Evagr., and it was only when certain amenities were restored to the Alexandrians, e.g. spectacles and baths, that the governor Florus was able to bring the situation under control. See Whitby 2000a, 77 nn.74–6, suggesting that the initial riots started already in winter 451/2, just after Proterius' appointment. Cf. Gregory 1979, 182–7, esp.185–7 on PZ's account. The reference to the soldiers' disregard for the sanctity of the baptistery may be an attempt to justify the brutal death of the patriarch (described at iv.2).

101 On whom see n.32 above.

with him if he should change [his opinion] at the council.¹⁰²

c. When he first arrived he made a great fight along with Dioscorus on behalf of the faith, [but] because imperial pressure had taken hold, and because of the flattery and compliments of the emperor who personally waited on the bishops at the banquet and showed them humility,¹⁰³ and promised to give to the honour of the see of Jerusalem the three provinces of Palestine,¹⁰⁴ the eyes of his mind darkened. He left the champion Dioscorus on his own, became a [member] of the opposing party, reneged on [his] oaths to God, and he and the bishops who were with him agreed to sign.¹⁰⁵ When the monk Theodosius and those who had gone with him [157] to observe carefully the proceedings of the council learned of these things, they immediately returned to Palestine.¹⁰⁶ Coming to Jerusalem, they made known the betrayal

102 It may be doubted whether Juvenal had offered such hostages to fortune, given that already at the First Session of Chalcedon he abandoned his erstwhile ally Dioscorus, *Acts Chalc.* I.282–4 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.115); *V. Petr. Iber.* 76/52, however, also claims that Juvenal was resolutely opposed to the Tome of Leo before setting out for Chalcedon, cf. *Joh. Ruf. Pleroph.* 20 (p.42). See Honigmann 1950, 240, Frend 1972, 149, Whitby 2000a, 78 n.77, Steppa 2005, 3. *Hist. Diosc.* 274 gives the text of a letter from Dioscorus to Juvenal attempting to ensure his loyalty at the council, which (if genuine) rather implies that there was some doubt as to his allegiance.

103 Marcian attended the Sixth Session on 25 October at which he delivered his speech (quoted above, iii.1, section 'I'). No other source refers to his attending the bishops at a banquet or courting Juvenal's support; Constantine, it is known, had shown great honour at a banquet to the bishops assembled at Nicaea, as Eusebius describes in *VC* iii.15. *Joh. Ruf. Pleroph.* 52 (p.106) claims that bishop Leontius of Ascalon was instrumental in persuading Juvenal to defect from the Miaphysite camp; he also, 25 (p.61), claims that Marcian paid great honour to Juvenal. As Honigmann 1950, 262–3, points out, Juvenal deserted Dioscorus already on the first day of the council (see n.102 above), and so PZ's assertion here is almost certainly an anti-Chalcedonian fiction.

104 I.e., Palaestina Prima, Secunda, and Tertia. This is likely to be a garbled reference to three further provinces, Phoenicia I and II and Arabia, added to those under his jurisdiction by the Home Synod of Constantinople in 450, while Theodosius II was still alive, although this agreement was nullified soon afterwards. See Honigmann 1950, 238, 245–6.

105 Juvenal was indeed part of the committee that drafted the final definition of Chalcedon, *Acts Chalc.* V.29 (*ACO* ii.1.2, pp.125–6), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 132; his signature was sixth on the list of signatories, VI.9.6 (*ACO* ii.1.2, p.141). That the bishops of the provinces under his jurisdiction were behind him is clear not only from the list of signatories, but also from *Acts Chalc.* I.283 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.115), cf. Honigmann 1950, 242.

106 Theodosius is referred to already in *Acts Eph. II*, 130/1, as a 'well-known monk' who visited Dioscorus in Alexandria to complain of the views of Domnus (of Antioch) and Theodore, cf. Honigmann 1950, 249. *Evagr.* ii.5 claims that he fell out with Dioscorus while there, however, and was beaten and then paraded around the city; as Whitby 2000a, 79 n.80, remarks, there is no way of confirming this assertion. He is not mentioned in the *Acts Chalc.*

of the faith, and called all of the monks to inform them. They gathered and were ready, and when Juvenal arrived they confronted him, reminding him of his promises and that he had failed [to keep them]. They requested from him that he protest and condemn what had happened. But he, imitating Pilate, said, 'What I have written I have written.'¹⁰⁷ The monks said to him, 'We do not accept you any longer because you have broken your oaths and your promises,' whereupon he went back to the emperor.¹⁰⁸

d. [Then] the contingent of monks and clerics returned to Jerusalem, where the people and the bishops who were with them assembled to consider¹⁰⁹ what they should do. [So] they decided to make someone else bishop in place [of Juvenal]. Having considered chaste monks such as

but, despite measures taken by the government to discourage monks and clergy from coming to Chalcedon (*ACO* ii.1.1, *ep.* 15, p. 29, tr. in Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 107–8, on which see Horn 2006, 79) he had been able to observe proceedings, and in particular Juvenal's desertion of Dioscorus already on the first day; he may have been among the monks and archimandrites summoned to the council (*Acts. Chalc.* IV.65–6, *ACO* ii.1.2, p. 115, and elsewhere), see Honigmann 1950, 248. If he took his leave already then, on 8 October, he will have reached Jerusalem well before any of the participants of the council, even if he travelled by land. See Horn 2006, 80–1 with Honigmann 1950, 248, Gray 1979, 18, Allen 1980, 103, on Theodosius' return and the rumours he spread in order to discredit the council in the eyes of his fellow Miaphysites (implying that the council had approved the veneration of two Sons, two Christs and two Persons) with n.59 above.

107 John 19.22, the words of Pontius Pilate: see Horn 2006, 82–3, on analogies drawn between Juvenal and the Jewish high priest who handed over Jesus to the Romans, cf. Steppa 2005, 9, Blaudeau 2006a, 590. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 20 (p. 42) likens Juvenal to the Antichrist.

108 Cf. Evagr. ii.5 on the trouble provoked by Theodosius. Theodosius successfully mobilised opinion against Juvenal in Palestine on a vast scale. *V. Petr. Iber.* 77/52, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 10 (p. 24), confirms the zeal of those who gathered to oppose Juvenal's return at Caesarea. The date of Juvenal's return is unclear, but is likely to have been in early 452; the metropolitan Severian of Scythopolis was assassinated around the same time by Theodosius' followers, and his death is commemorated on 21 February, see Schnitzler 1953, 738; see also n.124 below. Faced with such fierce opposition, the archbishop returned to Constantinople to seek imperial aid while Theodosius and the monks remained in control of Palestine. Marcian initially sought to reason with the insurgents, dispatching letters to dissuade them of their misapprehensions about the council (*ACO* ii.1.3, pp. 124–7, tr. in *RSCC*, 835–9, cf. Pulcheria's letter, *ACO* ii.1.3, pp. 128–9 with Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 182–3), but eventually in August 453 the archbishop was sent back with an armed force at his back. For details see Honigmann 1950, 250–6, Frend 1972, 151, Perrone 1980, 91–2, Winkelmann 1985, Whitby 2000a, 80 n.82, Horn 2006, 81–4.

109 So PZT, following MS V. The English translation of HB has *hšw*, and translates 'And the people, and the bishops who were with them, were distressed, and they consulted together as to ...'

Romanus,¹¹⁰ Marcan,¹¹¹ and other exceedingly marvellous men, they finally chose to make Theodosius [bishop], who was found [to be] zealous and who for years had struggled on behalf of the faith. They seized him by force, though he refused and swore oaths, pleading with them in order to try and persuade them to allow him to be the assistant of the one from among them whom they might appoint, but they were not persuaded and they blessed him and placed him on the throne.¹¹² When the rest of the cities of Palestine learned [of this], they brought to him individuals for him to ordain and become their priests, because they knew that this man was surpassing in virtue and zealous for the truth.¹¹³

a. [158] The fourth chapter concerns Peter the Iberian,¹¹⁴ recounting how he was seized by the people of Gaza, was brought to Theodosius, and became their bishop.¹¹⁵

Among these was also Peter the Iberian, a man famous throughout the world for [his] miracle[s]. He was a prince who had been given as a hostage to [Emperor] Theodosius [II].¹¹⁶ He [Theodosius] and his wife Eudocia¹¹⁷ loved him because of his virtuous qualities and he was raised

110 The recipient of several divine visions that confirmed the wrongness of Chalcedon and the archimandrite of a monastery near Tekoa, south of Jerusalem: see Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 25 (pp.57–63), *V. Petr. Iber.* 77/52, *De ob. Theod.* 8–11/25–7 with AK 306, Chitty 1966, 89.

111 Also an archimandrite, at Bethlehem: see Chitty 1966, 91–2.

112 See Honigmann 1950, 249: as he notes, Theodosius' hesitation is understandable, given that he was placing himself in a dangerous position. It may also, of course, have been a traditional display of humility for the sake of form: see Norton 2007, 197–9.

113 Theodosius moved swiftly to appoint anti-Chalcedonian bishops throughout the provinces under his control, see Honigmann 1950, 249–50, always choosing men approved by the local population, cf. *V. Petr. Iber.* 77/53 with Perrone 1980, 93–4, Kofsky 1997, 214, Whitby 2000a, 79 n.81, and Horn 2006, 87. Theoph. 107.6–27 offers a hostile account of Theodosius' tenure.

114 A detailed *Life* of Peter in Syriac survives, probably the work of John Rufus (*V. Petr. Iber.*), on which see Horn and Phenix 2008; his original Iberian name was Nabarnugius. For an in-depth modern assessment of his life and career see Horn 2006, 50–111, cf. *PLRE* ii, Petrus 13. On his influence on Zach. see Introduction, B (1), and Watts 2010, 132–4.

115 Peter initially sought to avoid ordination, *V. Petr. Iber.* 78/54, insisting upon his unworthiness, but bowed ultimately to divine and popular will. See Horn 2006, 89–91 and n.112 above.

116 See Horn 2006, 50–9, on Peter's Iberian (i.e. Georgian) origins, cf. Steppa 2005, 6–7. He was sent to Constantinople as a hostage c.429 in order to strengthen relations between (Christian) Iberia and the Roman empire.

117 Eudocia married Theodosius II in 421 but left the capital briefly in 438 to visit Jerusalem. She returned the following year, but in 441/2 moved to Palestine definitively, accused of

in the imperial household. He was put in charge of the royal horses,¹¹⁸ but laid down his functions and gave himself to the discipline of Christ, he as well as the eunuch John, who was his sponsor and father through water and the spirit.¹¹⁹ They prospered and God performed signs through their hands in Constantinople, but they fled from there and encountered the desert of Palestine, [where] they grew to love the work of asceticism. Although they wanted to remain hidden, they became very famous, performing signs like the apostles.¹²⁰

b. After travelling from place to place they arrived at the outskirts of Gaza and Maiuma, and the men, women, and all ranks of the administration seized Peter and transported him to Theodosius in Jerusalem, entreating him to make [Peter] their bishop. He levelled many accusations against himself and declined, but [Theodosius] placed his hand on him against his will and ordained him, because he knew the man. When [Peter] became agitated and called himself a heretic, after a brief pause Theodosius said to him, 'Your judgment and mine are before the judgment seat of Christ,' whereupon [Peter] retracted his statement and said, 'I am not a heretic, but a sinner,' and Theodosius, who was acquainted with the man, ordained him as priest [i.e. bishop] for the people of Gaza.¹²¹ There are other [159] excellent things that were done by this man, which I omit so as not to draw out my story.¹²²

adultery. A sympathiser of the Miaphysite cause, she there visited Peter once and sought (in vain) to see him again. See *V. Petr. Iber.* 71/48–9, Holum 1982, 176–94, Horn 2006, 73–4.

118 The Iberians were well known for their horses, which may explain this appointment. See Horn 2006, 63–4.

119 The atmosphere at Theodosius' court was remarkably ascetic, mainly as a result of the influence of Theodosius' sister Pulcheria. See Holum 1982, 91–2, Horn 2006, 64–5, Perrone 2008, 358. Peter was already a Christian when he arrived in Constantinople, even if he had not yet been baptised; indeed, he brought with him relics from Iberia. See *V. Petr. Iber.* 24–5/16–17. The original name of John, who may have been Peter's godfather, was Mithridatos; his family was from Lazica, on the east coast of the Black Sea. See *V. Petr. Iber.* 31/21 with *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 22, Horn 2006, 65.

120 *V. Petr. Iber.* 32–3/22–3 recounts their escape from Constantinople, probably in 437, after Theodosius had refused Peter permission to leave. See Horn 2006, 68–70.

121 *V. Petr. Iber.* 78/54–5 relates Peter's reluctant ordination at the hands of Theodosius on 7 August 452, cf. Frend 1972, 149, Horn 2006, 89–91. He was bishop of Maiuma, it should be noted, rather than Gaza (cf. e.g. Evagr. ii.5, AK 307); the former was the port of the latter. On the Christian zeal of Maiuma (especially compared to Gaza) see Horn 2006, 89 n.189, cf. our introduction, B (1).

122 Zach.'s statement, probably, rather than PZ's. It is possible that Zach. composed a *Life* of Peter himself, but the evidence is ambiguous: see Horn 2006, 45–6, cf. eadem and Phenix 2008, ix. It is clear at any rate that information on Peter was not lacking, given the lengthy *Life* of him that has survived, as well as the numerous references to him in the *Pleroph.*

a. The fifth chapter recounts the flight of Theodosius of Jerusalem from the threats of the emperor, concerning Juvenal who returned with an army of soldiers, and concerning the many [people] who were killed upon his entry [into the city].

While Theodosius was making progress in these affairs, Emperor Marcian caught wind of all that he was doing. Juvenal returned with the *comes* Dorotheus¹²³ and an army in order to arrest Theodosius, imprison him, depose any bishop whom he had consecrated by his authority, and punish the monks and the people and persecute them for their insolence and audacity because they had made Theodosius bishop in Jerusalem.¹²⁴ [Marcian] spared only Peter the Iberian, because he had been persuaded by the empress, even though [Peter] did not want to be in communion with the rest of the bishops.¹²⁵

b. When [Juvenal] arrived in Neapolis,¹²⁶ he found many monks there. At first he tried to seduce them with enticements. They were simple folk whose weapon and whose helmet were the true faith and righteous works. He tried to persuade them to be in communion with him. When they indignantly refused unless he condemned the violent acts that had taken place

123 See *PLRE* ii, Dorotheus 7, *comes et dux Palestinae* and van Esbroeck 1986, 147–8. In 452 he had campaigned against Saracens in Moabitis and upon returning to Jerusalem had found the city shut against him; in order to gain admittance he was obliged to acknowledge Theodosius as archbishop. See Honigmann 1950, 252–3. A letter of Dorotheus concerning the discovery of relics of Christ's clothing has been preserved, on which see van Esbroeck 1986.

124 Theodosius fled before Dorotheus and Juvenal reached Jerusalem with their forces in August 453: Marcian, in a letter apparently preceding Juvenal's return, indicates that he has heard that he had taken refuge at the monastery of Sinai, *ACO* ii.1.3, pp.131–2 (tr. in *RSCC*, 831–3). See Honigmann 1950, 255–6, for the dating of events with Frend 1972, 151–2. Bacht 1953, 251–2, places the expulsion of Theodosius from Jerusalem in late 452 or early 453, which is too early since Cyr. Scyth. *Vit. Euthym.* 27 (p.42) ascribes a twenty-month tenure to Theodosius. The restoration of Juvenal was accomplished with considerable bloodshed: see *Pan. Mac.* vii.5–7, viii.9–10 (38–40, 47–9), albeit a tendentious source, with Horn 2006, 91–2.

125 *V. Petr. Iber.* 81/57, with Horn 2006, 92, makes no mention of special treatment for Peter. The empress in question could be Theodosius' widow Eudocia, now resident in Palestine, rather than his sister Pulcheria, now Marcian's wife (the target of much anti-Chalcedonian propaganda, see e.g. Witakowski 1993, 63 with Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 3, p.14, PD i, 223/166, although see Joh. *Vit. Sev.* 222). So AK 308 against (e.g.) Kofsky 1997, 214 and Horn 2006, 92, 94 n.215; see also n.117 above. Soon afterwards, however, Peter was forced to withdraw to Egypt: see *V. Petr. Iber.* 82/58 with iii.7 below and Horn 2006, 93. In 453 pope Leo sought to bring pressure on Eudocia to accept Chalcedon, apparently with success, see *ep.* 117, 123, *ACO* ii.4, pp.69, 77, cf. Sivan 2008, 214–15, Wessel 2008, 325–6.

126 Modern Nablus, in Palestine I, a region with a strong concentration of Samaritans and Jews: see Frend 1972, 152, Pummer 2002, 233–4.

at Chalcedon, he said, 'It is the emperor's will,' but they still refused. So he gave orders to the soldiers and the Samaritans, who beat and killed the monks, while they were singing, 'God, the nations have entered your inheritance, and have defiled your holy sanctuary, and see: they are making Jerusalem a ruin!'¹²⁷ Some of the soldiers were moved [160] with pity and wept; others of them and the Samaritans killed many monks, whose blood was shed upon the ground.¹²⁸

a. The sixth chapter tells of a blind Samaritan who drew near in faith and rubbed some of the blood of those who had been killed into his eyes, [whereupon] they became opened.

A blind Samaritan, deceiving his guide, said, 'Because my eyes cannot see the blood of the Christians who are slain in order to enjoy it, bring me near so I can touch it.' When the guide brought him near to let him touch it, he dipped his hands in the blood, and bowed to the ground and wept, praying and supplicating that he might share in their martyrdom. He stood up, smeared his eyes with the blood, and raised his hands to heaven, [whereupon] his eyes became opened and he was able to see. Those who learned what had happened were amazed and came to believe in God, and the blind man was baptised; but those who obeyed the order of the emperor seized those whom they had left alive and drove them out from the whole district.¹²⁹

a. The seventh chapter concerns the appearance of our Lord to Peter the Iberian of Gaza, in which he told him he must depart with the [rest of] those who were being pursued.

They say that the famous Peter was [living] in peace. While being disturbed by no one because of the order of the emperor and the concern of

127 Ps. 78 (79).1, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 16 (p.33). Marcian's letter (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.127, tr. in *RSCC*, 838) refers to reports that the Samaritans had exploited the troubled situation to their own advantage, cf. Perrone 1980, 98, Rabello 1987, 146–7. Wood 2007, 271–2, suggests that Zach. is here criticising the imperial government for its brutality by associating Romans and Samaritans with barbarian behaviour.

128 Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 10 (p.24) and Sev. *Hom. Cath.* 125, *PO* 29 (1961), 252/3 allude to these violent clashes. See Hongimann 1950, 256, Chitty 1966, 90, Perrone 1980, 103. On the involvement of Samaritans see Sivan 2008, 116–17. Millar 2006, 125, cf. Lane Fox 1997, 187–8, notes allusions in the *V. Dan. Styl.* to Samaritan unrest in the early 450s.

129 This miracle is referred to by Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 10 (p.24), where the monk Andrew, a disciple of Peter the Iberian, is said to have witnessed it. The *Pleroph.* itself, composed c.500, recounts a whole series of such miracles that vindicate the anti-Chalcedonian cause. See Witakowski 1993, 62–4, Horn 2006, 18–27.

the empress for him, he saw our Lord in a vision who said to him indignantly, ‘How is it, Peter, that I am being pursued in my believing servants but you are residing peacefully?’ Peter repented and obediently left Gaza to depart with those who were being pursued.¹³⁰

a. [161] The eighth chapter gives information concerning Solomon, a zealous monk who contrived to approach Juvenal as though to be blessed by him, but [instead] dumped a basket filled with dust on his head and chastised him.

Juvenal, who through the cooperation of the Roman armed forces was pursuing the faithful and the monks throughout the countryside, came to Jerusalem and sat on the throne and paid no regard to his promises or to the killings that were taking place upon his arrival [in the city] or to his false oaths. One monk, whose name was Solomon, became agitated in spirit. He filled a basket with dust and ashes and placed it under his armpit. Under the honourable pretext of piety he approached, as though he wanted to be blessed by the hand of the archbishop; Juvenal rejoiced at [Solomon’s] arrival before him. As he was received by him, Solomon said to him, ‘May my lord bless [me].’ When the soldiers allowed him to draw near and approach him, he took out the basket of dust and poured it out over his head, saying, ‘Shame on you, shame on the liar and persecutor!’ When the [guards] were about to strike him, Juvenal did not allow it. He did not become angry, but was moved to penitence over this. He shook [the dust from] his head, sent the monk out from his presence, and ordered that he be given reimbursement [for his travel] and depart from his place [of jurisdiction]. The monk did not accept [the reimbursement], but did depart.¹³¹

a. The ninth chapter makes known how Theodosius, who was being sought by the Roman army, was arrested and imprisoned in a room containing lime, [where] he finally died.

While Theodosius [162] was being sought throughout the entire province¹³² on orders from the emperor, he put on a Roman uniform, with

130 This episode is not to be found in the *V. Petr. Iber.* 82/58, cf. *Joh. Vit. Sev.* 222. Peter left for Egypt in 455, see Horn 2006, 93, Blaudeau 2006a, 301–2. *Joh. Ruf. Pleroph.* 56 (p.111) offers a comparable instance of a divine vision spurring Peter to action (at the moment of Juvenal’s return).

131 This is the sort of anecdote that one would expect to find in *Joh. Ruf. Pleroph.*, but in this case there is no parallel, see AK 308. Honigsmann 1950, 263, sees in it a type of ‘literary revenge’ exacted by the powerless opponents of Chalcedon for Juvenal’s desertion of their cause.

132 *Syr. hyp̄rky*’, Gk. *hyp̄archia*, for *ep̄archia*.

hair and a helmet on his head, and went about strengthening and encouraging the faithful. But when he had come to the suburbs of Sidon he was seized at last by someone who recognised him, and was handed over to the soldiers.¹³³ The Nestorian party was so angry at him because he had been going about the whole district exposing and condemning the deceit of [Nestorius'] teaching, that they went up to the emperor and convinced him to let [Theodosius] be given to them so that they could keep him [in custody]. Then they imprisoned him in a small monastic cell in which there was caustic lime.¹³⁴

b. The adherents of the opinion of Nestorius used to come to him in groups and debate with him, hoping that under severe pressure he would change his mind and agree to their intention, but he used to defeat all of them and refute them, and as they were leaving ashamed and frustrated he would say to them, 'Even though I am imprisoned and cannot go about [freely] from place to place like I used to, so long as there is breath in my nostrils, the word of God is not imprisoned in me, but rather it shall proclaim justice and truth into the ears of those who hear.'¹³⁵ Now the Eutychian party¹³⁶ also imagined that he would agree with them, and they too gathered around him and debated with him. Contrary to their expectation he showed them

133 According to *De ob. Theod.* 4/22, Theodosius was recognised just outside Antioch on his way from Egypt to meet Simeon the Stylite and arrested; PZ's reference to Sidon, some distance from Antioch, therefore represents a slightly different version. See Steppa 2005, 72, Horn 2006, 29, on his arrest, cf. Honigmann 1951, 179 n.1. We may suppose that Theodosius was bald, and that his wig allowed him to escape the notice of most of his pursuers; in the same way the anti-Chalcedonian bishop Longinus was able to effect his escape from Alexandria in the 570s, on which see Joh. Eph. *HE* iv.8 with Dijkstra 2008, 290–1.

134 Lit. 'lime that cannot be neutralised,' probably CaO, quicklime, so Horn and Phenix 2008, 290 n.3. Theodosius was sent to Constantinople, where he was interned in the monastery of Dios, see *De ob. Theod.* 5/23 with Horn 2006, 29–30 and Horn and Phenix 2008, 288 n.6. Blaudeau 2006a, 589 n.41, suggests that Zach. included this detail in the *HE* originally. According to the *De ob. Theod.*, his sufferings were increased because he was held in a narrow cell over the winter. For details on the effect of lime on health see Horn and Phenix 2008, 290 n.3; see also Ammianus 25.10.13, the death of the Emperor Jovian in 364 in a recently replastered room with the comments of den Boeft et al. 2005, 333–4. Theodosius died in early 457, just after the death of Marcian on 27 January (see Croke 1978) and the accession of Leo, *De ob. Theod.* 6–7/23–5.

135 *De ob. Theod.* 5/23 recounts how the archimandrite of the monastery of Dios sought, without success, to browbeat Theodosius into accepting the council.

136 This group is the target of sustained criticism by Zach., as Blaudeau 2006a, 586–7, brings out. Cf. PZ v.4 below and note pope Leo's reference to their presence in Constantinople in 457, *ep.* 44 in *ACO* ii.4, p.138, with Blaudeau 2006a, 394–5.

that they were in agreement with Valentinus,¹³⁷ Mani,¹³⁸ and Marcion,¹³⁹ and that their heresy was even more absurd than those of Paul of Samosata,¹⁴⁰ Apollinarius,¹⁴¹ or Nestorius.¹⁴² So, when they were defeated by him, they departed from him in turn,¹⁴³ [163] and because they were adding hardship after hardship upon him, his soul had become conditioned for the good fight. [Theodosius] happened upon some writings of John the Rhetor from Alexandria, which were full of deceit and defect, being a heresy, and he exposed and condemned it.¹⁴⁴ Having completed his race, contended in the fight, and kept his faith, he finally passed away, and leaving the prison, he

137 The leader of a Gnostic tendency in the second century who played down the human nature of Christ. See *EEC*, 1155–6, Chadwick 2001, 100–2.

138 The religious leader, A.D. 216–274/7, who founded his own dualist movement, which was also influenced by Gnosticism. See *EEC*, 707–9, *ODB* ii, 1285–6.

139 A second-century heretic who favoured the rejection of the Old Testament from the canon of Christian scripture. See *EEC*, 715–17, Chadwick 2001, 41.

140 A controversial bishop of Antioch, c.260–8, who believed that ‘Christ was a man assumed into union with God, but by inspiration rather than by incarnation’, whose views were rejected by a synod in Antioch in 268: see *EEC*, 885–6, Chadwick 2001, 166–9 (quotation from 168). Nestorius explicitly rejected his views: see Camelot 1951, 221–2.

141 Bishop of Laodicea (Syria), who lived from c.315 to 392. A follower of Athanasius of Alexandria who emphasised the one nature of Christ, wholly God and wholly man, arguing that the divine Word took the place of the soul in Christ’s human body. See Frend 1972, 13, Young 1983, 182–91, *EEC*, 79–80, Chadwick 2001, 518–19. As Frend, *op. cit.*, 19, 41, notes, certain Miaphysites came close to Apollinarius’ views, as emerges especially from the accusations made against Eutyches by Diogenes of Cyzicus, *Acts Chalc.* I.160 (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.91). Eutyches nevertheless explicitly condemned Mani, Valentinus, Apollinarius (and Nestorius) at Ephesus II in 449, *Acts Chalc.* I.164, (*ACO* ii.1.1, p.92). See Samuel 1977, 30–4, 51 (defending Eutyches), Camelot 1951, 237–8 (more critical).

142 On whom see n.11 above.

143 Theodosius thus wanted to proclaim his moderate Miaphysite credentials, distancing himself from Eutyches, who had gone further than Cyril in his stress on the one nature of Christ (see n.11 above). Marcian, *Actio* 29 in *ACO* ii.1.3, p.131.11 (tr. in *RSCC*, 831), accuses Theodosius of supporting Photinus, Apollinarius, Valentinus and Nestorius and indeed, *ACO* ii.1.3, p.125.6 (tr. in *RSCC*, 836) of agreeing with Eutyches. See also *De ob. Theod.* 2/21, which records strife in the mid-450s between Romanus (n.110 above) and a certain archimandrite Timothy, who was accused of denying Christ’s consubstantiality with man, with AK 309 and Horn and Phenix 2008, 284 n.1. According to this work, Theodosius himself set off for Antioch in order to resolve the dispute, and it was at this point that he was captured (see Perrone 1980, 115 and n.133 above). There was some embarrassment among Miaphysites on account of Dioscorus’ backing for Eutyches at Ephesus II: see Lebon 1946, 517–20 and Grillmeier ii.4, 16–17/16–18, and cf. n.64 above.

144 John was a Miaphysite of Eutychian leanings: see Blaudeau 2006a, 260, 595 with Sev. *Sel. Let.* v.6 (356–7/316), *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 20 and the next chapter below.

departed to Christ our Lord, leaving behind an example of courage for the faithful.¹⁴⁵

a. The tenth chapter recalls the heresy of John the Rhetor who was in Alexandria, how it came about, and how it came to be condemned. John was an adherent of Palladius,¹⁴⁶ an Alexandrine sophist, and was his double. Thus he was called ‘Rhetor,’ because the words ‘rhetor’ and ‘sophist’ designate a philosopher.¹⁴⁷ In the days of Proterius, who succeeded Dioscorus, [John] saw that the whole city of Alexandria was zealous for the faith, and that [Proterius] was plundering and persecuting to make them agree with the council and accept the Tome [of Leo]. They hated Proterius, and so he attempted to ingratiate himself with the masses in order to distinguish himself, collect money, and be honoured by hollow glory. But he did not read Scripture, and was not edified by the power of the mysteries in it, and was not trained in the ancient teachers of the holy church. Without knowing what he was saying, or against what he was arguing, he became conceited to write as an illustration [that] the Word of God [was like] a seed that swelled up into a body, and that he suffered [in his own nature], if he suffered [at all]. But he denied that [the Word] was united to a human body, and he did not believe in the natures from which [164] the One Christ was manifested. He prepared statements [to the effect] that, ‘It should not really be called a nature, because he became embodied from the Virgin without the seed of a man,’ and he said that, ‘He was neither by her nor from her,’ and he did not agree with the teachers of the church who say that God the Word united himself with human nature and became a human being.¹⁴⁸

145 *De ob. Theod.* 6/24 claims rather that Theodosius died soon after being released from his cell in early 457, cf. n.134 above. See also Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 54 (p.109), who records a vision of Theodosius’ death.

146 *PLRE* ii, Palladius 8, otherwise attested only in a work *Contra Iulianistas*, cited in Wright 1871, 940 and in PZV, i, 113 n.1 (with a Latin translation).

147 The translator of the Greek hardly understood this passage and rendered it into gibberish clothed in Syriac words. The English translation offered here is a conjecture. The term ‘rhetor’ had other meanings in antiquity, however, since it could also refer to a lawyer: see Greatrex 2001b, 150. The term ‘sophist’ is equally broad, often referring simply to a high-profile public speaker or orator, cf. Bowersock 1969, 13, Anderson 1993, 1 with the discussion in Côté 2006, 2, 8–9.

148 Zach. appears here to be fulfilling his brief set out at the start of the book, i.e. succinctly guiding Eupraxius through the disputes among anti-Chalcedonians, making clear the errors of those who deviated from the orthodox path, as he saw it. The more extreme Miaphysite doctrine advocated here, throwing into question Christ’s human nature, was to prove a popular tendency among anti-Chalcedonians in Egypt: Blaudeau 2006a, 165–6 notes parallels with Isaiah of

b. With vain words such as these he used to speak nonsense, and used to write books that were self-contradictory, at times agreeing with Apollinarius, at times [agreeing] with Eutyches, and at other times [offering] something new, because he was uncertain about the things he was writing. He did not sign his books with his own name, lest they be found faulty, but sometimes he wrote the name of Theodosius the bishop of Jerusalem on one, sometimes that of Peter the Iberian on another, so that even the faithful were duped into accepting them. It is said that while in a monastery Peter the Iberian once came across one of these books that had been written in his name. When he picked it up and read it, he became enraged, and anathematised whoever wrote it. Not only there, but also in Alexandria, Palestine, and Syria he and Theodosius condemned the writings of this man.¹⁴⁹

a. The eleventh chapter [recounts] how John the *silentarius*¹⁵⁰ was sent

Hermopolis and Theophilus of Alexandria, cf. Grillmeier ii.4, 17–18/18–20; see also PZ ix. 9–14 on Julian of Halicarnassus.

149 There is a lengthy excerpt that is similar to this passage, to be found in BL Add. 12,155 fol.125^v (printed in PZT i, 113 n.1). This text is as follows:

John the Rhetor was a student of the Alexandrine sophist Palladius. And in the days of Proterius, when he saw the persecution of the orthodox and of the entire city, with a speech he contended against Proterius, eager for vain glory and reward, and he aligned himself with the orthodox. Yet he was a sophist, who had not trained in the divine teachings of the church, and he did not know what he was saying and the things against which he was fighting, and he stood against the holy fathers. He set down many writings, and at times he followed [the writings] of Apollinarius, at times the writings of Eutyches, and again at other times he discovered a new teaching. He said that God the Word suffered in [his] essence [*ousia*], but he did not write out his name in his writings, but dared to place on them the names of great persons – of Theodosius, the chief of the bishops of Jerusalem, and of Peter the Iberian, and of other teachers, and so by these names he led the naïve astray. It happened that Peter entered one of the monasteries and they gave him a speech that was written by John. When he read it, he became very agitated, and condemned the one who wrote it, and [affirmed] that nothing in these [writings] was his own, and whether written or not written he condemned [them] many times in Alexandria and in Palestine. Timothy the bishop of the Alexandrians condemned it, and Zachariah made known all of these things to his clerics, when he wrote [concerning] the events in the churches that took place after the Council of Chalcedon.

See Perrone 1980, 115–16, on the counter-measures taken by Peter and Theodosius. The latter, he notes, was well-known to be a prolific writer, cf. *ACO* ii.1.3, p.133.15–16. Forged works were similarly attributed to Timothy Aelurus: see Ebied and Wickham 1970, 358 (alluding to false accusations of forgery).

150 See n.62 above on John. This mission is also referred to in *ACO* ii.1.3, pp.129–30, ii.5, pp.3–4, tr. in Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 154–6, cf. 183, and by Leo, *ep.*141 (in *ACO* ii.4, p.94), a letter of May 455. Hence John's mission can be dated to between late 454 (after Dioscorus' death) and early 455.

by the emperor to admonish the Alexandrians to be united with Proterius after Dioscorus had died in Gangra.

When the Alexandrians heard that Dioscorus had fallen asleep, there was great distress and pain. On account of their love for him, after his death they proclaimed him to be [still] alive, and his name was set in the diptychs; but may no one from among those who are careful to censure what is not according to the exact order [of the church canons] criticise [this action]. [165] The party of the faithful wanted to set up a bishop to replace [Dioscorus], but they were afraid of the threats of Emperor Marcian, who was sending letters in every direction [containing] threats against anyone who did not agree with the Council and who did not accept the Tome.¹⁵¹ Thus, when [Marcian] learned that certain Alexandrians intended to set up for themselves a bishop after the death of Dioscorus, he sent John, the head of the *silentiarii*, with letters to admonish the Alexandrians to be united with Proterius. This John shared the opinion of the emperor and was an astute man. When he arrived and saw the crowd, the many chaste monks who with boldness of speech were defending the faith, and the formidable crowd of the faithful who were joined with them, he was astounded and said, ‘I intend, our Lord willing, to inform the emperor and to persuade him on your behalf.’ He took from them a petition that gave an account of their faith, of all that had been done to them by Proterius, his deceit, his injustices, and the expenses that he wastefully paid out from the church [funds]. [This was written] in a lengthy document that I refrain from reproducing here, so that I not become tedious to the reader.¹⁵²

b. When John returned to the emperor, and informed him of what had happened, [Marcian] said to him, ‘We sent you to persuade the Egyptians, admonishing [them] so that they might be persuaded to accept our will, but

151 Documents such as the letter cited in the previous note (to the monks of Alexandria), enjoining them to adhere to the council’s decisions and seeking to demonstrate that Chalcedon was in accordance with the teachings of Athanasius and Cyril: see Blaudeau 2006a, 146–7. Marcian also issued a number of edicts after the council, confirming its decisions and imposing penalties on those who refused to accept them. See *ACO* ii.2, pp.113–16, ii.3, pp.348–52 (Latin), ii.1, pp.478–83 (Greek), tr. in Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 128–36. On the presence of names on the diptychs see Blaudeau 2006a, 346–7: they were read out during the liturgy and thus indicated that those named were viewed as orthodox and worthy to be commemorated. See also n.99 above.

152 Either Zach. or PZ had access to the document itself and preferred to omit it, although it is more likely that the latter suppressed it. Such a document might have been useful for Eupraxius, whereas PZ, on the other hand, clearly felt it his duty to spare the reader some of Zach.’s elaborations: see PZ vi.7b.

you have returned to us contrary to our intention, since we have found you to be an Egyptian!’ However, when he became informed through what had been written about Proterius in the deposition that the monks had sent, he censured [Proterius’] pride and malice.¹⁵³ While Marcian was [occupied] with these affairs, he died, having reigned six and a half years,¹⁵⁴ and Majorian¹⁵⁵ who reigned with him four years [also] died.¹⁵⁶ After him, [166] Anthemius,¹⁵⁷ Severus,¹⁵⁸ and Olybrius¹⁵⁹ received the empire, and after one year Leo I joined them, so that the lives of the four of them comprised seven years.¹⁶⁰

a. The twelfth chapter concerns Anthemius, Severus, Olybrius, and Leo, who reigned altogether in succession seven years. Anthemius reigned five years and was killed by Ricimer.¹⁶¹ Severus reigned with him one year and then died. Then Olybrius, who reigned after Severus with Anthemius for one

153 John’s intervention was unsuccessful and Marcian issued a further constitution (*ACO* ii.2, pp.24–7 = *C.J.* i.5.8) on 1 August 455 prescribing harsh measures for those who opposed the council’s decisions, see Blaudeau 2006a, 147–8. There is no record elsewhere of any criticism of Proterius by Marcian and the story is likely to be an anti-Chalcedonian fiction, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 332 n.363. Blaudeau 2006a, 614 n.211, further suggests that the anecdote may represent an attempt to mitigate his criticisms of Marcian, cf. n.3 above.

154 Marcian died on 27 January 457, see *PLRE* ii, Marcianus 8.

155 *Syr. mwryn*, ‘Morian’ or ‘Maurian.’ *Mich. Syr.* ix.1 (241a/126, not derived from *PZ*) also mentions Majorian, Anthemius and Olybrius but refers to all three as ‘Caesar’, as opposed to emperors such as Marcian and Leo. On both *PZ*’s and *Mich. Syr.*’s treatment of western emperors see Lange 2010.

156 The synchronism is incorrect: Majorian actually became emperor in the west in the course of 457 and was killed in 461. He was, however, active in western affairs from 454 onwards. See *PLRE* ii, Majorianus and MacGeorge 2002, 188–213.

157 Sent by Leo from the East to rule in the West in 467, he survived for five years before succumbing to Ricimer’s intrigues (in July 472). See *PLRE* ii, Anthemius 3, MacGeorge 2002, 234–55.

158 Libius Severus came to the western throne on 19 November 461, succeeding Avitus after an interregnum of three months; he died, probably of natural causes, on 14 November 465. He is generally regarded as having been a puppet of the patrician Ricimer. See *PLRE* ii, Libius Severus 18 and MacGeorge 2002, 15–33.

159 Western emperor from April to November 472, the successor of Anthemius, on whom see *PLRE* ii, Olybrius 6 and MacGeorge 2002, 255–60.

160 Leo I reigned in the East from 7 February 457 to 18 January 474. *PZ*’s or *Zach.*’s calculations here are therefore quite inaccurate, although all three of the western emperors’ reigns did coincide with Leo’s.

161 Sources differ on whether Anthemius was slain by Gundobad, Ricimer’s nephew, or by Ricimer himself, while being besieged in Rome. See *PLRE* ii, Anthemius 3, MacGeorge 2002, 254–7.

year¹⁶² died, then [came] Leo I, who reigned for three years with Anthemius and then for two years after him.¹⁶³ In the first year of Leo's reign, Antioch was overturned by earthquakes and a great fire occurred.¹⁶⁴ In the second year of his reign, Sulifus,¹⁶⁵ the Gothic usurper, was killed. In the third year of his reign, Aspar the *magister militum* and his sons were killed.¹⁶⁶

b. In this third book and in the above chapters that are in it is a span of thirteen and a half years, [comprising the following order]: the reigns of Marcian and Majorian¹⁶⁷ were six and a half years, and those of Anthemius, Severus, Olybrius and Leo I who reigned both in succession and with each

162 This is thoroughly confused: Olybrius succeeded Anthemius, see n.159 above.

163 As noted above (n.160), Leo enjoyed a reign of some 17 years.

164 See Whitby 2000a, 94 n.131 on this earthquake, reported by Evagr. ii.12 and Mal. 14.36, whose chronology is disputed; detailed discussion in Downey 1961, 476–80, 597–604, cf. Mango and Scott 1996, 171. It occurred in September 457, 458 (advocated by Whitby, following Downey) or 459 (Mango and Scott). No other source refers to the fires that broke out subsequently, but the destruction, as recounted by Evagr., was extensive. Eutychius, 101–3, col.1056, refers to a 'fiery cloud' and lightning at this time.

165 No king of this name is known. AK 309 therefore prefer to read 'Aiulfus', a ruler of the Suevi who was defeated and killed by the Visigoths in Gallaecia in 457, so also Blaudeau 2006a, 529 n.176. See *PLRE* ii, Aiolfus with Hydat. 180. It is unlikely, however, that such a relatively minor event, in the far west of the empire, is what is here referred to. More likely the chronology is incorrect and the reference is to a Gothic leader in the East, perhaps the Ostrogothic leader Valamir, who died c.465, thus between the other two events referred to here by PZ. See *PLRE* ii, Valamir with Stein 1959, 356, Heather 1991, 247–50, Croke 2005, 176. *PLRE* ii, Vilibos, suggests, however, that he is the figure referred to: Joh. Ant. frg. 297 (= Priscus frg.54.1, cf. 54.2) relates his death during the joint reign of Anthemius and Leo, placed by *PLRE* in 469/70.

166 In 471 both Aspar and his son Ardaburius were killed on suspicion of plotting against the Emperor Leo. Aspar had been instrumental in the accessions of Marcian and Leo, but tensions with the latter set in soon after his accession. See *PLRE* ii, Aspar, Stein 1959, 258–61, Treadgold 1997, 153–5, Croke 2005, 195–200. His other son Patricius may also have been eliminated at the same time, *PLRE* ii, Patricius 15.

PZ's chronology of Leo's reign is seriously flawed, compressing events of seventeen years into five (above) or three (here). The fact that the events here related are ascribed to the first, second and third years of his reign raises the suspicion that the chronicler may have altered or invented them in order to ensure consistency with his earlier statement (of Leo's brief reign). Evagr. ii.7 is also confused about western events, although his account of successive rulers is slightly less garbled. See Allen 1981, 106, noting variations in the manuscript tradition. Blaudeau 2006a, 529 n.176, suggests that these events were reported by Zach. himself, rather than being insertions by PZ from the chronicle source. Zach.'s aim in including brief references to disasters was, he argues, an attempt to demonstrate the fatal consequences of Marcian's support for Chalcedon.

167 See n.155 above on this name.

other lasted altogether seven years.¹⁶⁸ This period began in the third year of the 305th Olympiad, and ended in the 308th Olympiad.¹⁶⁹

168 Marcian's reign was approximately six and a half years (August 450–February 457), Majorian's four (457–461), but they were not synchronous. As seen above (nn.156–63), PZ has confused the order and duration of the reigns of the western emperors and drastically reduced the length of Leo's. From this passage and the opening of book iv, with its reference to the Emperors Leo I and II, it is possible to infer that Zach. or (more likely) PZ divided the reign of Leo I into two sections, attributing some of it to his son, Leo II, who in fact was only promoted to the rank of Augustus in November 473 and died one year later, aged seven, ten months after the accession of Zeno. See Croke 2003 on Leo II's reign (with no discussion of PZ, however).

169 The third year of Olympiad 305 runs from summer 443 to summer 444; the fourth of 308 runs from summer 456 to summer 457. These dates are clearly at odds with the references in the section above to events in Leo's reign, i.e. well after 457. Zach. or PZ must have relied upon another source for this reference.

BOOK FOUR

a. [166] This fourth book is also from the work that the rhetor Zachariah composed in its twelve constituent chapters that are clearly written out below. It makes known what happened after the death of Marcian, Majorian¹, Anthemius, Severus and Olybrius, who reigned [167] twelve years all together as the chronicle² makes known. [It tells about] the events that took place in Alexandria and in Ephesus in the days of Leo [I] and Leo [II], [who reigned] for [a total of] twenty years;³ about the ordination of Timothy the Great, who is called ‘the Weasel’;⁴ how Proterius was killed, he who succeeded Dioscorus after the council of Chalcedon, and after [whose] death his clergy presented *libelli* to Timothy, and sought to come into the church, but the zealous bishops⁵ who were with him and the people did not permit them [to do so], whereupon they went to Rome and informed [pope] Leo who [wrote] letters to Emperor Leo, which censured the ordination of Timothy.

b. [Book Four] also gives information concerning the letter that [Timothy] wrote to [Emperor] Leo, that censured the additions [to the faith] that had been made at the Council [of Chalcedon], and the Tome; concerning John who became [bishop] of Ephesus after Bassianus who resigned, and about the encyclical letter⁶ of Emperor Leo, which he wrote to the bishops [asking them] to state in writing what they thought of the matters that had been

1 See PZ iii n.155.

2 The chronicle referred to is most likely a source used by PZ rather than Zach, cf. PZ ii.5 and Blaudeau 2003, 174 n.102. See PZ iii.12 on PZ’s rather inaccurate chronology of the reigns of the western emperors.

3 See PZ iii n.166 for PZ’s problems with the chronology of Leo’s reign (457–474).

4 Gk. *Ailouros*, sometimes also translated as ‘Cat’. See Ebied and Wickham 1970, 115 n.1 for the translation as ‘Weasel’ with the detailed discussion in Blaudeau 2006a, 354–6, who shows that the epithet was more often used by his adversaries than his supporters. Zach. offers an explanation of the term’s origins below, iv.1a.

5 Syr. *kahnê*, ‘priests’.

6 Syr. *’nqwqlly*, Gk. *enkyklika*. The Syriac has ‘letters’ in the plural, as does Evagr. ii.9 (p.59.18), no doubt because multiple copies of Leo’s letter circulated.

decided at the Council. All of them, with the exception of Amphilochius of Side, wrote approvingly. Timothy was [then] banished to Gangra, and from Gangra to Cherson, and after him Timothy who is called Wobblecap⁷ became [bishop] through the members of the party of Proterius. [Book Four also gives information] about bishop Isaiah and Theophilus the priest, who were shown to be Eutychians, and about the letter that Timothy wrote concerning them which exposed them.⁸

c. The first chapter gives information concerning the ordination of Timothy the Great, who is called ‘The Weasel,’ and about the events that took place [in connection with it]. The second chapter shows how Proterius was killed, dragged away, and his corpse burned in fire. The third chapter reports [168] that after Timothy appeared as the sole bishop, the rest of the clergy of Proterius wanted to enter the church by means of *libelli*, but that [the people] and the zealous bishops who were with Timothy did not allow them [to do so]. The fourth chapter makes known that those men who were not accepted [into the church] got ready and went up to Rome and met with Leo the chief bishop⁹. The fifth chapter tells of Timothy and what happened in Ephesus to John who became [bishop] after Bassianus. The sixth chapter recounts the petition of Timothy and the censure that he wrote in it to the emperor concerning [Pope] Leo and his letter. The seventh chapter tells about what the bishops wrote to the Emperor Leo in [response to] his encyclical concerning the Council and [what happened to] Amphilochius [of Side], who did not agree with what the rest of the bishops wrote. The eighth chapter concerns the letter of Anatolius to the emperor, [accusing him] of having influenced the bishops concerning what they had written about the Council. The ninth chapter tells about the exile of Timothy, and about the [events] that occurred upon his departure from Alexandria. The tenth chapter recounts concerning the other Timothy, who became

7 Syr. *re’ulpeqila*, Gk. *salophakiolos*, i.e. a turban (*phakellos*). Some have interpreted the nickname as referring to a white turban (cf. Lib. *Brev.* 16/105). If the interpretation ‘Wobble-cap’ is preferred, one might take it literally or metaphorically (in the sense that he was inconsistent in his doctrinal approach). See Whitby 2000a, 94 n.128. Blaudeau 2006a, 357–8, notes that Zach. is the first author to use the epithet. Timothy was also known as ‘Basilikos’ because of his support for the Chalcedonian stance of the emperor (*basileus*), cf. Evagr. ii.11, Meyendorff 1989, 190 (who sees it as a term of abuse).

8 Following a brief summary of the contents, PZ offers next a chapter-by-chapter outline of the book. Given that such chapter-by-chapter outlines are to be found also in books vii–xii, one may infer that they are the work of PZ, while the briefer summaries may be ascribed to Zach. We comment on the items mentioned in the actual chapter rather than here.

9 Lit. ‘chief of the priests,’ and so rendered throughout.

bishop through the members of the party of Proterius, and who was called ‘Wobblecap’. The eleventh chapter makes known how Timothy was taken from Gangra to Cherson. The twelfth chapter tells about the Eutychians Isaiah and Theophilus, and about the letters that Timothy wrote concerning them, which exposed them.

d. The timespan covered by this history is the two or three years of Leo I and the seventeen years less two months of Leo II,¹⁰ as the chronicle makes known, for [169] Timothy the Great¹¹ was bishop in Alexandria for more or less two years, and then he was banished to Gangra. After eighteen years he returned to his see and died soon [after that].

a. The fourth book; concerning the ordination of Timothy and concerning those things that happened in the days of Emperors Leo I and Leo II.

The first chapter of the fourth book recounts the ordination of Timothy the Great who is called Aelurus, and what took place [afterwards].

While this was the state of affairs in the church of Alexandria, suddenly the news was heard that Marcian had died.¹² Everyone took courage, and considered, along with the entire order of the monks, whom they should make bishop from among the party of the faithful,¹³ for at this time the commander Dionysius was not there, but rather was staying in Egypt.¹⁴ They thought of Timothy, one who fasted and was a practitioner¹⁵ [of asceticism], who had been brought from the desert by force to Cyril who ordained him a

10 See PZ iii n.166 on Zach.’s (or PZ’s) problems with the reigns of Leo I and II. See n.1 above on the chronicle.

11 As PZ generally refers to Timothy Aelurus. He became patriarch in March 457, was exiled to Gangra in 459/60, returned to Alexandria in 475/6 and died on 31 July 477. Evagr. iii.4 (perhaps from Zach.) also puts Timothy’s exile at 18 years, whereas *V. Petr. Iber.* 110/80 puts it at 17 and his total period as bishop at 22 years. See AK 310.

12 Marcian died on 27 January 457; see PZ iii n.154. Leo I was proclaimed emperor in Constantinople on 7 February. News of the emperor’s death reached Alexandria around 5 February: see Schnitzler 1938, 10. As Krüger 1884, 79–80, notes, opponents of Chalcedon had great hopes that a new emperor would lead to a change of church policy, cf. Devreesse 1930, 258, Frend 1972, 155 with *V. Petr. Iber.* 94/68, where it is implied that Leo would have backed Timothy.

13 I.e. as a successor to Dioscorus for the anti-Chalcedonian party.

14 See *PLRE* ii, Dionysius 7, which identifies him as the *comes Aegypti*. Schnitzler 1938, 11, argues that Evagr. ii.8 (here following Zach.) is wrong in placing him in Upper Egypt, since he returned to Alexandria so quickly; rather, he suggests, he was in the southern part of Aegyptus I, i.e. in Lower Egypt.

15 Syr. *pratyqs*, Gk. *praktikos*, cf. AK 330 for this translation. Blaudeau 2006a, 605, suggests rendering the term as ‘wonderworker’.

priest.¹⁶ He was of the same faith as Dioscorus, and was learned in the whole truth of the faith of the teachers of the church.¹⁷ The people of Alexandria and the monks dragged him and brought him to the Great Church that is called the *Caesarion*.¹⁸ Three bishops were sought to ordain him according to the rule of the canons,¹⁹ but because only two Egyptian [bishops] were available it was necessary that another [170] be found.²⁰ While they were searching for [a bishop], some of the people learned about Peter the Iberian

16 Syr. *qaššiša*, lit. 'elder', hence in 444 or earlier, see Whitby 2000a, 85 n.98. Timothy brought out hitherto unpublished works of Cyril and, according to Theophanes (111.9–11), made changes of his own, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 572 n.412. On his background see further Blaudeau 2006a, 150.

17 Timothy composed several works against the Council of Chalcedon, including a collection of citations quoted *in extenso* below, iv.12 See Blaudeau 1996, 117–23, for a favorable assessment of his output as a theologian, *idem* 2006a, 365 n.492, for a detailed consideration of his works, with di Berardino 2006, 346–8.

18 A detailed account of these events is provided in a letter sent to Leo by the Egyptian clergy loyal to Proterius, *ACO* ii.5, p.11.35–17.20 (= *CE* 7), which was cited by Evagr. ii.8. As AK 311 suggest, Zach. may have been aware of the letter and have been writing his account to refute it. *V. Petr. Iber.* 91/65–6 offers a version close to that of PZ.

The *Caesarion*, known also as the Great Church, had once been the temple of the imperial cult; it was where the philosopher Hypatia was killed in 415. See Haas 1997, 210–11, 283, 313. It lay just north of the agora, see Martin 1984, 217–18, McKenzie 2007, 175 fig.299, 177–8, 250, Watts 2010, 157.

19 See L'Huillier 1996, 36–41, Horn 2006, 95 n.219, Norton 2007, 21, 33–4. The fourth canon of Nicaea stipulated the need for three bishops, a canon cited on more than one occasion at Chalcedon, e.g. *Acts Chalc.* XIII.22 (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.60), where it is mistakenly referred to as canon six, cf. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 29 n.12. Anti-Chalcedonians still abided by this rule in 575 when Longinus, bishop of the Nobades, and two other bishops consecrated Theodore as patriarch of Alexandria, *Joh. Eph. HE* iv.10 with Frend 1972, 327.

20 *V. Petr. Iber.* 91/65–6 claims that only two bishops ordained Timothy, Eusebius of Pelusium and Peter the Iberian himself, who happened then to be in Alexandria, although a marginal note in Sachau 321, fol. 81^r, col. 2, right margin states, 'In another account, which is composed about the blessed Peter, we found in it that it is said [that there were] three bishops who made Timothy [a bishop].' See Horn and Phenix 2008, lx and 138 n.3. This remark clearly cannot refer to our account here but might refer to Zach.'s biography of Peter, to which Evagr. ii.8 may also be alluding, since the letter of Timothy to the Emperor Leo which he claims is in Zach.'s account is not to be found in PZ: see AK 311–12, Allen 1981, 107, Whitby 2000a, 89 n.109. Blaudeau 2006a, 573 n.419 (cf. 662), prefers to suppose that Evagr. relied on the *V. Petr. Iber.* for his information while Horn 2006, 31 n.104, concludes that 'Zachariah Rhetor, John Rufus or even an anonymous writer could be possible candidates for the authorship of the 'Life of Peter' in question here.' She rightly rejects (*ibid.*, 95–6) PZ's version implicitly, since he (or more probably Zach.) may well have sought to bolster Timothy's credentials. *CE* 7 in *ACO* ii.5, p.13.28, the letter of the Egyptian bishops, also refers to two bishops only. For an exhaustive analysis see Blaudeau 2006a, 149 n.246. Évieux 1995, 70–1, 206–12, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 149 n.247, rejects the involvement of Eusebius, arguing that he was no longer still alive at this point.

who had left Palestine, and was residing there in Alexandria.²¹ So they ran quickly and seized [Timothy], and carried him on their shoulders so that he would not touch the ground. As they were bringing him, they heard a voice like the one that Philip [had heard] in the presence of the eunuch of Candace the queen,²² [as though speaking] through the multitude of the clergy, the monks, and the faithful people of the city [who said], ‘Ordain him [even] by force and unwillingly and seat him on the chair of Mark!’²³ He was weak in body from much [self-]mortification, and on account of his emaciation the members of the party of Proterius used to mockingly call him ‘The Weasel.’²⁴

b. When Dionysius the general learned what had happened, he considered that he might be criticised should the emperor hear that there were two bishops in the city. When he arrived, he led the entire Roman army and seized Timothy and many were killed. He commanded that they take him to the place called The Tomb of Osiris.²⁵ When he had gone, the battle of the citizens against the soldiers intensified. There was a great tumult and there were killings daily, especially since [Dionysius] was goading and threatening the soldiers who were called *foederati*,²⁶ who were wrathful men

21 See Blaudeau 2006a, 302, on his withdrawal from Palestine to Egypt. Horn 2006, 92 and n.207, suggests that Peter had remained in Palestine for 18 months after Juvenal’s return; he would thus have left for Egypt in early 455.

22 Acts 8.29. *V. Petr. Iber.* 91/66 also alludes to the same episode, although the emphasis is different, referring rather to Peter’s sudden disappearance after the ordination, cf. Acts 8.39. As Blaudeau 2006a, 604 n.139, notes, this sort of direct divine intervention is more typical of hagiography than ecclesiastical historiography.

23 The insistence on Timothy’s unwillingness is in marked contrast to Th. Lect. 368–70, who accuses him of engineering his own election, cf. PZ iii n.112 above on the topos of refusing honours. Blaudeau 2006a, 604 n.139, noting the reference to Alexandria as the seat of St Mark, suggests that Zach. may have elaborated on the theme of apostolic succession here, an element excised by PZ.

24 See n.4 above on this nickname.

25 Syr. *qēbarasarin*. A Syriac calque of the Greek Taphosirion, 50 km south-west of Alexandria, the modern Abūšīr on Lake Mareotis, the site of a Roman fort: see P. Grossmann in *The Coptic Encyclopedia*, i (1991), 34–6. In the third century the patriarch Dionysius had also been taken here during the persecutions under Decius, Euseb. *HE* vi.40; Blaudeau 2006a, 518 n.124, suggests that Zach. is deliberately echoing Euseb. here. *V. Petr. Iber.* 92/67 confirms Timothy’s removal by Dionysius, adding that his brother Anatolius was seized with him, and expiates on the sufferings inflicted by the soldiers.

26 Syriac has *qrtdwn*, which is probably a corruption of *pdrtwn*, Gk. *phoideratōn*, i.e. *foederati*. Some of these might be Goths (see next note), but others might be Romans, cf. Olympiodorus, frg. 7.4, ‘the name *foederati* was given to a diverse and mixed body of men’ with Jones 1964, 663–4.

and Arians.²⁷ So the one who had authority over the funds of the church expended them on the soldiers who were fighting with the people.²⁸ It then happened that a multitude of them and their women fell to the sword and were destroyed, and they were divided against each other, and fought [each other]. When such confusion had seized the city for a number of days, Dionysius was forced to bring [in] Longinus,²⁹ [171], a monk famous for his chastity and virtue, and he entrusted Timothy to him, to restore him as before to the city and to his church, on the condition that the conflict in [the city] cease and the killings stop.³⁰

c. When Timothy returned to the Great Church from which he had been taken out by force, and Proterius had seized for himself the church that is called the Quirinian,³¹ it happened to be Holy Week,³² and countless children

27 *C.J.* i.5.12.17 (527) states that ‘we often enroll Goths in the devoted *foederati*’, cf. Jones 1964, 664 and Greatrex 2001a, 78–9: their Arianism was tolerated because of their usefulness. On Gothic *foederati* in Egypt see (e.g.) Gascou 1976, 155–6, Carrié 1995, 54–6.

28 In other words the *oikonomos* or steward (see *ODB*, 1517), evidently at Proterius’ insistence, spent church money on Roman soldiers.

29 Longinus was the abbot of the monastery of Enaton, of whom a biography in Coptic survives, *V. Long.* See PZ iii n.96 for a reference in this work to his involvement in the resistance to Chalcedon. As AK 313 point out, Longinus emerges from *V. Petr. Iber.* 91/64 as one of Timothy’s supporters, cf. *V. Tim. Ael.* 165 (based on *V. Petr. Iber.*) whereas Zach. places him rather in the role of a mediator. See also Horn and Phenix 2008, 136 n.1.

30 *Evagr.* ii.8, following *CE* 7 (the letter of the Egyptian bishops), p.14.13, places the blame for the violence firmly on the shoulders of Timothy and his supporters, while *V. Petr. Iber.* 92–4/67–8 takes the opposite view. See further Frend 1972, 135, Horn 2006, 96. The ordination took place on 16 March 457. Blaudeau 2006a, 150–1, rightly stresses the awkwardness of Dionysius’ position in the absence of clear instructions from the new emperor, whose attitude remained unknown. This would explain why, having removed Timothy, he subsequently allowed him to return; AK 313, cf. Schnitzler 1938, 12, on the other hand, call into question the accuracy of Zach.’s version, i.e. the return of Timothy before Proterius’ death, pointing out that no such return is referred to in *CE* 7 or *Evagr.*

31 The church of Quirinus is heard of already in 339, when it was the target of an Arian mob: see Martin 1984, 218, Haas 1997, 271, McKenzie 2007, 242, 250; its location is uncertain, although AK 313 propose a location east of the city. The Great Church is the Caesarion, on which see n.18 above.

32 *Syr. zbn’ dptyr’*, lit. ‘the time of unleavened bread,’ a reference to the paschal meal that Jesus celebrated the night before his crucifixion. Our sources vary in the date they ascribe to Proterius’ death: *CE* 7, p.14.15, cf. *Evagr.* ii.8 (tr. Whitby 2000a, 88), place it on Easter Sunday (31 March), *Vict. Ton.* §19, a.457 (= *Th. Lect. frg.7*) places it on Good Friday, while PZ, *Lib. Brev.* 15/101 and Gelasius, *ep.99* in *Coll. Avell.*, p.445.11–12, put in on Maundy Thursday (28 March), which is the most plausible; Schnitzler 1938, 12 n.16 assembles the evidence. *V. Petr. Iber.* 95/68 oddly dates Proterius’ murder to 4 Nisan (April), explicitly stating that it was twenty days after Timothy’s ordination, which is consistent. John Rufus may have shifted it

who were candidates for baptism were brought to him [to be baptised], so that on account of their multitude the scribes and the readers of their names grew weary. But to Proterius only five [children] were brought. The people were so devotedly attached to Timothy that they drove [Proterius] out of the church of the Quirinian, [whereupon] killings took place.

a. Chapter Two shows how Proterius was killed, dragged through the city, and in the end his corpse was burned in fire.

As Proterius continued to threaten and rail against the Roman [soldiers] because they were taking money from him, but their hands were [still] not filled with the blood [of his enemies], one soldier became agitated in his soul and enraged. When he called Proterius to have a look, so that he could point out to him the corpses of the slain, he, along with his fellow soldiers, suddenly and discreetly pulled out a sword, stabbed him in the ribs, and killed him.³³ They dragged him to the Tetrastylon,³⁴ announcing concerning him, 'This is Proterius!' Others suspected that this was a deceptive plot, so the soldiers left his corpse and went off. When the people understood what had happened, they again became agitated, and dragged the corpse and burned it in fire in the hippodrome.³⁵ Thus did such a death happen to Proterius, the one who did evil to the Alexandrians, just as it had to George the Arian, who likewise suffered in his death and was so treated.³⁶

forward exactly one week, from Thursday 28 March to Thursday 4 April in order to play down the drama of the event: so Blaudeau 2006a, 151 n.261.

33 A very different account may be found in the letter of the Egyptian bishops, *ACO* ii.5, p.14.11–12, and *Evagr.* ii.8, where the Alexandrians are held responsible (not soldiers), acting at Timothy's instigation. Cf. *Vict. Ton.* §19, a.457 (= *Th. Lect. frg.*7), who blames the populace for the murder, while *Theoph.* 110.32–111.3 attributes it directly to Timothy, claiming that six others were killed in the baptistery (presumably of the church of Quirinus) where he had taken refuge, cf. *Th. Lect.* 368, McKenzie 2007, 250. *V. Petr. Iber.* 95/68, like Zach., holds a soldier responsible. Behind these two versions lies a letter of Timothy to Leo which, according to *Evagr.* ii.8, Zach. used in his account. See n.20 above for the suggestion that *Evagr.* here refers to Zach's biography of Peter rather than *HE*. See Schnitzler 1938, 12, Blaudeau 2006a, 151, for a full discussion, cf. Davis 2006, 89.

34 In the agora/forum, just to the south of the Caesareum/Great Church, at the centre of the city: see Haas 1997, 368 n.27, McKenzie 2007, 255 and fig.304, p.178.

35 These details are confirmed by *Evagr.* ii.8 (following *CE* 7, the letter of the Egyptian bishops, p.14.16–23), who adds that they dragged his corpse all through the city and even ate his entrails; having burned his body, they then scattered his ashes to the winds. Cf. *Eutych. Ann.* 108, col.1056. See Blaudeau 2006a, 151, Barnes 2006, 724, cf. Watts 2010, 194–5 on the ritual aspects of the murder. The hippodrome lay in the south-western part of the city, see McKenzie 2007, 250.

36 An allusion to the fate of the Arian bishop George, who, in December 361, was murdered by a pagan mob, after which his body was paraded through the city, then burnt, and his ashes

a. [172] The third chapter [recounts] that when Timothy was recognised to be the sole bishop, the rest of the clergy wished to enter the church as penitents by means of *libelli*,³⁷ but neither the people nor the zealous bishops³⁸ [who were] with them allowed [this].³⁹

When Timothy was recognised to be the sole chief of the bishops⁴⁰ in Alexandria, he showed through his deeds how a bishop ought to be: the silver and gold that were being given to the soldiers in the days of Proterius he spent on the poor, the widows, the reception of strangers, and those in need in the city, so that in a short time the rich men, perceiving that things were being administered better than under [Proterius], offered him funds with love and kindness, as well as gold and silver.⁴¹

b. But the priests and the clergy who had been with Proterius, knowing all of [Timothy's] virtues and his angelic way of life and the devotion of the citizens to him, united and in one accord made *libelli* and beseeched him that they should be received [into the church], promising that they would arrive in Rome in the presence of Leo and censure him because of what he had invented and written in the Tome. Among these men were some who were competent, eloquent, abundant in wealth and honour and of famous lineage, who had been called to the clergy by Cyril, and who were honourable in the eyes of the soldiers.⁴² They presented to Timothy a petition on their behalf, and Eustathius of Beirut wrote that they should

thrown into the sea: see Ammianus 22.11.8, Socr. *HE* iii.2, Soz. *HE* v.7 with Haas 1997, 293, Brennecke 1998, 28 n.23, Whitby 2000a, 85 n.99.

37 Sing., *libellus*, i.e. a document, often a complaint, accusation or petition, cf. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 208.

38 Lit. 'priests.'

39 Timothy, by contrast, favoured only mild conditions for those who wished to rally to his party: see Tim. Ael., *Syriac Letter* 2 in Ebied and Wickham 1970, 361, cf. 330. PZ is right to emphasise the intransigent nature of a significant number of anti-Chalcedonians in Alexandria: see Blaudeau 2006a, 153, on the awkwardness of Timothy's position with Tim. Con., *De iis*, 44.

40 Lit. 'chief of the priests'.

41 Zach. thus implies that the Alexandrian elite, despite their earlier backing for Proterius, now rallied to Timothy; *V. Petr. Iber.* 96/69 also implies that he drew support from every quarter, cf. Evagr. ii.8 with Blaudeau 2006a, 337–8. Haas 1993, 301–2 and n.14, suggests that Timothy's generosity may have come partly at the expense of the imperial treasury, a factor that contributed to his expulsion. See further PZ v n.72 below. PZ passes over the replacement of Dionysius as *comes Aegypti* by Stilas; two other officials were also exiled because of their failure to prevent Proterius' death. See Whitby 2000a, 89 n.111 with *PLRE* ii, Stilas and Dionysius 7 and Blaudeau 2006a, 159 n.311.

42 Evagr. ii.9, quoting Leo's encyclical (circular letter), notes the broad base of support that Timothy commanded, cf. Haas 1993, 301.

be accepted.⁴³ However, the envy of the people of the city and the hatred against these men had increased as a result of what had happened in the days of Proterius, and on account of their various sufferings they did not allow these [men to enter the church]; rather they instructed others to cry out, ‘Not one of them shall set foot here, neither shall the transgressors be received!’⁴⁴

[173] a. The fourth chapter tells how these men got ready and went up to Rome and made known what had happened. This resulted in matters becoming turned around and confused. For when these men had been insulted and were not accepted, they betook themselves to Rome, and recounted the fearsome death of Proterius, and the scorn for the canons, and [added] that [Proterius] had died for the Council and for the honour of Leo, that they [themselves] had suffered many insults, and that Timothy had appeared and had received the episcopacy⁴⁵ illegally. They caused the matter to be odious and disgraceful in the eyes of Leo, and they incited him against Timothy.⁴⁶

a. The fifth chapter tells about Timothy and what happened in Ephesus to John who was bishop there after Bassianus.

I shall now recount how it happened that Timothy was delivered up. After the death of the Emperor Marcian, and while Anthemius, Severus, and Olybrius reigned for [only] short lives in Italy and in the lands beyond,⁴⁷ Leo

43 His involvement is puzzling, given the distance from Beirut to Egypt; see PZ iii n.49 for his role at Chalcedon. AK 314 suggest that there is a misreading of the bishopric here, and that the reference might be to a place in Egypt, e.g. Bara on the lower Nile, or Barethu. Against this is the fact that a Eustathius was certainly bishop of Beirut at this time and that he resurfaces in PZ’s account at iv.9 below.

44 See Gregory 1979, 189–91, on the profound divisions within the Egyptian church. The rich, as PZ here makes clear, tended to support the imperial candidate for the patriarchal throne, while the lower classes backed the opponent of Chalcedon. These hard-liners are referred to by Tim. Con. (writing before the seventh century), *De iis*, col.44, who notes how supporters of Dioscorus reacted badly to Timothy’s willingness to accept followers of Proterius into the fold and therefore cut themselves off from him. See also Blaudeau 2006a, 595, on Zach.’s hostility towards these hard-liners, cf. vi.1–4 below.

45 Lit. ‘priesthood’.

46 Leo’s letters confirm that he was well informed of what had transpired in Alexandria, cf. Blaudeau 2006b, 150. Schnitzler 1938, 16, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 132/116, notes how in early July he wrote to Anatolius in Constantinople to urge him to intervene, *ep.* 146 (*ACO* ii.4, pp.96–7), cf. 145 (to Leo, *ACO* ii.4, pp.95–6). No other source refers to the presence of these opponents of Timothy at Rome, cf. Frend 1972, 160, Blaudeau 2006a, 287–8, 613.

47 I.e. Gk. *tois anō topoīs*, as AK 314 suggest.

I [reigned] with them and received the kingdom after them in Europe.⁴⁸ He was a faithful and strong man, but simple in faith.⁴⁹ [Emperor Leo] learned of the evil things that were taking place in Egypt, in Alexandria, in Palestine, and everywhere [else], and that many had been stirred up because of the Council, and that also in Ephesus many had been killed at the arrival of John who succeeded Bassianus after he had resigned and fled so as not to sign [the statement of faith] at Chalcedon.⁵⁰ Now John betrayed the rights and honors of the see of [Ephesus] because he desired preeminence, so that they in Ephesus call him [even] today ‘The Traitor,’ [174] and they erased his name from the Book of Life.⁵¹ Then Emperor Leo, who accepted the letter from Timothy of Alexandria, wanted to assemble a council, but Anatolius, the bishop of the imperial city, prevented him not because he was able to

48 An allusion to the *interregnum* that followed Olybrius’ death in November 472; Glycerius did not succeed to the western throne until 473 and Leo backed an alternative candidate, Julius Nepos, who seized Rome in 474. See also PZ iii.11b-12a above. On this passage see Lange 2010, sections 1.2, 3.1, noting that PZ’s notion of a re-unification of the empire under Leo is without parallel. On the western rulers here mentioned see (e.g.) Heather 2000, 26–7.

49 A description that recalls PZ’s characterisation of Patricius at vii.4g. Given that Leo’s accession has already been dealt with (iv.1), these details appear superfluous and probably therefore derive from a different source than what precedes. It is more likely that PZ, rather than Zach., was drawing on another source here, perhaps works of Timothy himself. Blaudeau 2006a, 462 n.6, suggests that the description is designed to exculpate the emperor for having been convinced by Anatolius to back Chalcedon.

50 Bassianus had taken over the see of Ephesus in an irregular fashion c.443 and was subsequently ousted by rebellious clergy four years later, to be replaced by Stephen. Stephen therefore represented the see at Ephesus II and Chalcedon, but at the latter council Bassianus appealed for reinstatement. Sessions eleven and twelve dealt with the matter and decided that neither should retain his position, cf. Honigmann 1953d, 151–4, 160–3 (noting how Zach. never once refers to Stephen), Maraval 1998a, 99–100, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 1–3, for a summary. Norton 2007, 223–31, analyses the affair in detail. Neither therefore signed the declaration of faith of the council, since neither held the see any longer. The council was in any case especially objectionable to them because it enshrined, in its Canon 28, the primacy of the see of Constantinople in the East, allowing its patriarch to consecrate bishops of Ephesus; hitherto, bishops of Ephesus had claimed primacy in the diocese of Asia. See L’Huillier 1996, 267–96, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 67–70, Blaudeau 2006a, 295–6, Price 2009a, 83–4, Whitby 2009, 193–4. John must therefore be the new bishop consecrated (at Constantinople, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 427 n.204) following the removal of the two rivals; nothing further is known of him beyond what PZ here recounts, although by the terms agreed at Chalcedon, *Acts Chalc.* 12.9 (*ACO* ii.1.3, p.54) he should have been elected by the Ephesians themselves. No other source refers to these disturbances.

51 I.e. John assented to Canon 28 of Chalcedon, see preceding note with Blaudeau 2006a, 593 and n.66. On the ‘Book of Life’ see PZ iii, n.99.

find fault with anything that Timothy had written, but he was wary lest, when the council assembled, it would annul everything that had been done at Chalcedon, not concerning the faith, but concerning the rights and honours that had been given illegally to the see of the imperial city. Thus Anatolius persuaded the emperor not to assemble a council, but to solicit the will of the bishops concerning the council and the ordination of Timothy through written letters called encyclicals.⁵² So [the emperor] began to write to the bishops an encyclical letter concerning Timothy and concerning the Council of Chalcedon to the following effect.⁵³

b. 'Without fear of man or partiality, and without artifice or flattery, setting the fear of God alone before your eyes, and considering that to him alone you must make your defence and give your account, make known to me in brief what is acceptable to you, the priests of our dominion, examining what has been done at Chalcedon, and concerning the ordination of Timothy of Alexandria.'⁵⁴

c. When an imperial letter such as this had been given to Leo of Rome, he wrote two letters to Emperor Leo, one concerning Timothy, and another on behalf of the party of Proterius, in which he also indicated, concerning the clergy of Constantinople, that they were of the same mind as Timothy.⁵⁵

52 Anatolius' desire not to jeopardise the newly acquired privileges of Constantinople (especially Canon 28), which had provoked strong opposition, notably in Rome, is plausible. See Frend 1972, 160–1, Maraval 1998a, 113, Blaudeau 1996, 129–30, 408–9. Pope Leo was no keener on an ecumenical council, see Hofmann 1953, 28, Grillmeier ii.1, 137–70/120–49, Wessel 2008, 332. Leo, *ep.* 150 in *ACO* ii.4, p.98 (of July 457), confirms that it was Timothy Aelurus and his supporters who wanted a new council.

53 Leo's circular (encyclical) was sent out to 65 metropolitan bishops and three renowned holy men of the East in autumn 457, in order that they summon local councils to discuss how to proceed in the wake of events in Egypt and what attitude to take to Chalcedon; many of the replies survive, and the collection of documents is known as the *Codex Encyclicus* (*CE*), to be found in *ACO* ii.5, pp.9–98. Leo's own letter is *ACO* ii.5, p.11.5–34; Evagr. ii.9 gives a Greek version of the letter (addressed to Anatolius of Constantinople and the other metropolitans). See Frend 1972, 160–1, Grillmeier ii.1, 221/195, Whitby 2000a, 89 n.112.

54 This is a paraphrase of the final section of Leo's letter, on which see preceding note. The first part describes what had occurred in Alexandria in relatively neutral terms, as Haacke 1953, 109–10, cf. Schnitzler 1938, 20, rightly underlines (but cf. Whitby 2000a, 89 n.112).

55 Brooks, *PZV* i, 121 nn.1–2 identified the two letters of Leo of Rome in this passage as 156 and 165 respectively, cf. Allen 1981, 109, Whitby 2000a, 91 n.116. Leo's *ep.* 156 is dated 1 December 457 (*ACO* ii.4, no.97, pp.101–4). It condemns the events in Alexandria and is critical of Anatolius' mildness and of the clergy of the capital. *Ep.* 165 (of 17 August 458, *ACO* ii.4, no.104, pp.113–31, also in Schwartz 1927b, 62–85), sometimes referred to as the Second Tome, contains a detailed defence of Chalcedon (rather than discussing Timothy), along with citations from the church fathers; the next sentences of *PZ* clearly refer to a dogmatic work.

He called Anatolius ineffectual, and also defended [175] the Tome that he had [written] on account of Eutyches, and which had been accepted at the assembly of Chalcedon. However, in a similar way he also wrote distinctly in this letter concerning the becoming human of Christ, which Emperor Leo forwarded to Timothy of Alexandria. When [Timothy] had received it, he wrote a petition to the emperor similar to the one below.⁵⁶

a. Chapter Six, which makes known the petition of Timothy, his faith, and the charges he made against the letter of Leo [of Rome].

‘O tranquil and serene emperor, because to discerning persons there is nothing more honourable than the soul, but rather we have learned both to despise the body and not to diminish the soul,⁵⁷ therefore, as much as I am able with [my] strength, I am careful to preserve my soul, lest prior to the time of judgment I be condemned as a lover of the body, and [thereby] prepare against myself the fire of Gehenna.

b. I think that all who are discerning of virtuous things desire that nothing should occur that is hateful to their brothers. Accordingly, in writing this petition I make known to Your Tranquillity that from my youth I learned the holy books; and from the divine mysteries that are contained in them I became edified, and until now I have been solicitous at all times concerning the true faith that is according to *the teaching* and the tradition of the apostles and my fathers, the teachers. While being joined to these by the grace of God our saviour, I have reached the present stage [in life]. I confess the one faith that our saviour and creator Jesus Christ handed down when he became a human being and sent forth the blessed apostles, saying, ‘Go and teach to all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.’⁵⁸ [176] For the Trinity is perfect and equal in essence,⁵⁹ in glory and in blessedness, in which there is not anything that

See also Evagr. ii.10 (who confuses the two letters, as Whitby notes), Grillmeier ii.1, 224 n.10/197 n.10, Blaudeau 2006a, 159–60, stressing how Leo’s letter is crafted in order to be more palatable to the Egyptian church, which is why a Greek translation of it was preserved in the anti-Chalcedonian collection published by Schwartz 1927b, 56–62. On Pope Leo’s dealings with the East in this period see Hofmann 1953, 24–30.

⁵⁶ This is *CPG* 5485. Schnitzler 1938, 22, wrongly identifies the letter Timothy received with Leo’s *ep.* 156. While several of Timothy’s works have survived, this is the only version of this petition (Greek, *deêsis*) to have survived, with the exception of a small section (noted below) and a Georgian version, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 160.

⁵⁷ Matthew 16.26.

⁵⁸ Matthew 28.19.

⁵⁹ Syr. *kyana*.

is less or greater. For thus taught the 318 blessed fathers,⁶⁰ and concerning the true embodiment of our Lord and saviour Jesus Christ, who became a human being according to the [fore]knowledge of his [divine] economy,⁶¹ I continue to believe with them, as do all those who prosper in the true faith. For in [this faith] there is nothing obscure, and the symbol of the preaching of the faith of our holy fathers needs no addition.⁶² Those who do not hold these things, who are corrupted by heresy, I reject, and I too flee from them. For it is a sickness that destroys the soul: the teaching of Apollinarius, the blasphemies of Nestorius,⁶³ and those who have gone astray concerning Jesus Christ's embodiment, [he] who became incarnate from [our nature], [who] introduce into [his incarnate nature] a division into duality, and who also split the economy of the only begotten Son of God, and those who say concerning [Christ's] body that it was taken from heaven, or that God the Word underwent some change, or suffered in his nature,⁶⁴ and [who] do not confess that he was united to a human and ensouled body from [our nature]. I say to those who have fallen into any of these heresies that you have been led greatly astray, and you do not know Scripture,⁶⁵ and I shall not associate with them or love them as believers. I am joined to, hold to, and

60 Assembled at the Council of Nicaea, held in 325, at which 318 bishops were said to have been present: see *ODB*, 1464–5, Chadwick 2001, 198. See Blaudeau 2006a, 278, on this appeal to Leo.

61 This sentence, 'For the Trinity...', survives in Greek in a collection of citations from the church fathers about the incarnation of the Word, put together perhaps by Anastasius of Sinai (seventh century); it may be found in Mai 1833, 35 and Diekamp 1907, 165 (ix), cf. Lebon 1908, 700. The quotation is introduced as follows: 'Timothy Aelurus, the opponent of truth, said in the letter he wrote to the Emperor Leo through the *silentarius* Diomedes...'

62 Timothy thus insists that Chalcedon innovated gratuitously: he would rather just maintain the definition of faith adopted at Nicaea, for which see Socr. *HE* i.8, Stevenson 1987, 344–7. Canon 7 of the Council of Ephesus (431) had explicitly forbidden the elaboration of further creeds (see *Acts Chalc.* I.943, *ACO* ii.3, pp.221–2), which thus strengthens Timothy's arguments; see Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 190, Gwynn 2009, 19. Pope Leo responds to these accusations already in *ep.* 156 (*ACO* ii.4, p.102.25–7), pointing out 'It could not possibly have happened that at that Council [of Chalcedon] we held views contrary to the holy Council of Nicaea; this is a lie put out by the heretics, who act as though they are the ones who hold the faith of the Council of Nicaea' (tr. Hunt). In July 450 Leo had been critical of these conservative tendencies, *ep.* 69 in *ACO* ii.4, p.31: he had consequently asked Theodosius II to hold a council in Italy to condemn those who, by endorsing Nicaea, disguised their own heretical views.

63 Leo, *ep.* 165 (*ACO* ii.4, p.114.1, 9 [against Apollinarius], p.113.15 [against Nestorius]), specifically attacks both of these heresies, the former in the context of a wider criticism of Eutyches.

64 Syr. *kyana*.

65 Matthew 22.29.

truly believe in, and am therefore concerned to live according to, the faith that was [declared] at Nicaea.⁶⁶

c. Now when the distinguished *silentarius* Diomedes⁶⁷ arrived and gave me the letter of the bishop of Rome, I examined it but was not satisfied with the [statements] that are in it. Lest the church be disturbed, O lover of Christ, until now I have not read it or criticised it before [the faithful]. I believe that [177] God has cast it into the mind of Your Tranquillity to correct the [statements] that are in this letter, which create a stumbling block to the faithful, because [its contents] are joined to and agree with and are close to the teaching of Nestorius, who was anathematised because he tore and divided the embodiment of our Lord Jesus Christ, splitting [it] into two natures, *hypostaseis*,⁶⁸ properties,⁶⁹ names, and operations,⁷⁰ these [things] that are not in the confession of the faith of the 318.⁷¹ For they proclaimed that the only begotten Son of God was consubstantial⁷² with his Father, that he came down and was incarnate and became a human being, and suffered, and rose and ascended into heaven, and is coming to judge the living and the dead. They neither mentioned in [this statement] natures, *hypostaseis*, or properties, nor did they divide [Christ after the Incarnation]. Rather they confessed the divine [properties] and the human [properties] to be of the one [Christ] through the [divine] economy.⁷³ Thus I do not consent

66 On the christology put forward here by Timothy see above all Lebon 1908, who notes, 683, another exposé of his faith sent to Leo by the *comes* Rusticus contained in BL Add. 12,156 (edited and translated by Nau in *PO* 13 [1919], 241–7) which should not be confused with this one; it was sent just after he went into exile. See Lebon 1909, 95–6, Nau 1909b, Grillmeier ii.4, 27–35/27–35; Blaudeau 2006a, 161, places it just before Timothy’s exile, on the other hand. Timothy consistently rejected Apollinarius’ views; initially, however, he supported Ephesus II and Eutyches’ position, but soon backed down, see Schnitzler 1938, 14–15; Lebon 1908, 685–97, is more sympathetic. According to his interpretation, Timothy refused to distinguish between persons and natures, cf. also Lebon 1951, 461–7; hence two natures implied two persons, which was an unacceptable dividing of the one Christ. For him, God became man through the divine economy. He distanced himself from the Eutychians by firmly insisting on the double consubstantiality of Christ.

67 Nothing further is known of the *silentarius* Diomedes: see Whitby 2000a, 91 n.116, *PLRE* ii, Diomedes 1.

68 Syr. *qnumê*, Gk. *hypostaseis*.

69 Syr. *dilyata*.

70 Syr. *ma’bedanwata*.

71 I.e. the Council of Nicaea, see n.60 above.

72 Syr. *bar kyana*, lit. ‘son of the nature,’ which is the typical Syriac rendering of Gk. *homoousios*.

73 Timothy accurately summarises the creed of Nicaea, stressing the emphasis it places on Christ and God the Father being of the same nature (*homoousios*): see Stevenson 1987, 344–7,

to those things that have been done at Chalcedon, because I have found in them the division [of Christ], and a split in the [divine] economy.⁷⁴

d. Now, O victorious emperor, accept me, who have spoken these things in confidence on behalf of the truth, so that Your Power may prosper as on earth, so too in heaven,⁷⁵ and accept this my petition peaceably, because in these letters from the West runs the sedition of scandal, because they divide the [divine] economy. I entreat that these letters be annulled by every tongue so that Christ God may be purely confessed, who in truth suffered in the flesh, but remained without suffering in his divinity, that [divinity] which he possesses with the Father and the Holy Spirit.⁷⁶ I entreat and supplicate Your Honoured Head that [a decree] be sent to everyone that they must hold to the confession of the definition of the faith of our fathers, the 318 [of Nicaea], which succinctly [178] proclaims the truth to all of the churches, and annuls all heresies and the fraud of scandalous teachings. [The teaching of Nicaea] is not in need of correction, but rather these [things] that have appeared to me ...' Since they are stated at length with quotations refuting them [i.e. the Chalcedonians], we shall not mention them here, so as not to bore the reader,⁷⁷ since the faithful may find in every place refutations against them by [those who are] discerning, first of all by Dioscorus, and after him by this Timothy, and after him by Peter⁷⁸ and by Philoxenus of Mabbugh⁷⁹ and by the eloquent Severus, chief of the bishops of Antioch, in his *Against the Grammarian*,⁸⁰ and by Cosmas⁸¹ and Simeon of Legina,⁸² and in the letter of the Alexandrians.⁸³

The end of the sixth chapter.

Chadwick 2001, 199, Ayres 2004, 93. He is replying to Leo, *ep.* 165 (*ACO* ii.4, p.114.18–24) where he also quotes the Nicene creed.

74 See Lebon 1908, esp.698–9: Timothy emphasises that Christ was only man through divine economy (i.e. not by nature).

75 Matthew 6.10.

76 Cf. Lebon 1908, 690, on the importance of the divine nature for Timothy.

77 This is, of course, PZ's intervention: the authors named below include writers from after Zach.'s time. He has thus excised much of Timothy's letter, which was probably present in Zach.'s version.

78 Peter Mongus, Timothy's successor as anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Alexandria.

79 Active in the reign of Anastasius, on whom see PZ vii.12b and n.208.

80 Probably a reference to Severus' *Contra gram.*, on which see Allen 2004, 44–6 and PZ vii.10e below.

81 A monk at the monastery of Mar 'Aqiba of Chalcis, see PZ viii n.104 below.

82 See PZ viii n.103 on Simeon, one of those expelled in Justinian's persecutions in the 530s.

83 It is uncertain to which letter PZ is referring, although, given that the list is in chronological order, one may presume that it is a work of the mid-sixth century.

a. The seventh chapter recounts what the rest of the bishops except Amphilochius of Side wrote to [Emperor] Leo, who declared [themselves to be] in conformity and in agreement with the teaching of the Council.

Timothy wrote confidently to [Emperor] Leo, as was [presented above], concerning the letter [of Leo of Rome] and concerning the Council of Chalcedon. The other bishops, the metropolitans of every place, when they had received the encyclical letter of the emperor, made known the things that had been done by them at Chalcedon, agreed to them, and protested at the ordination of Timothy whom Leo, the bishop of Rome, named ‘The Antichrist.’⁸⁴ They say that the rest of the bishops were also influenced to write by the instigation of Anatolius and the letters [that he wrote] to them.⁸⁵ Only Amphilochius of Side conducted himself fearlessly, according to the truth and with uprightness. [179] He and the other bishops who were under his authority boldly wrote to censure and reject what had been done at the Council and [what was] in the Tome, and made known the coercion and the hypocrisy that took place there, with copious demonstrations and arguments from Scripture and the fathers. He implored the emperor that the [acts] of the Council should be annulled, because they were a cause of offence and confusion to the faithful.⁸⁶ However, he censured the ordination of Timothy,

84 The implicit accusation made by Leo against Timothy in *ep.* 156, *ACO* ii.4, p.102.19–20, tr. Hunt, p.243.

85 Schnitzler 1938, 23–5, followed by Grillmeier ii.1, 229–30/202–3, plays down this intervention on Anatolius’ part, arguing that his deacon Asclepiodotus, for instance, who was dispatched to the bishops in order to lobby in favour of Chalcedon (*Lib. Brev.* 15/102), would have had little time to exert pressure on the eastern bishops. On the other hand, Mich. Syr. ix.5 (250c/145), claims that Anatolius informed bishops by letter that Leo’s circular was a test of loyalty and that they should therefore ensure that they support Chalcedon. *CE* 10 (*ACO* ii.5, p.22.24–5) confirms Anatolius’ dispatch of letters; Anatolius’ letter is no.137 in Grumel 1972. Blaudeau 2006a, 157 and n.305, notes that the 34 surviving replies, representing 280 bishops and monks, are suspiciously unanimous, cf. Marc. com. a.458, Th. Lect. frg.9 (= Vict. Ton. §33, a.468). On the question of numbers and what has survived see Grillmeier ii.1, 229–30/202–3, Blaudeau 2006a, 158 n.310. See also n.54 above on the relatively neutral tone of the letter sent out by Leo to enquire of the bishops’ opinions.

86 See Allen 1981, 109 and Whitby 2000a, 92 n.119: Evagr. ii.10 claims that Zach. included Amphilochius’ letter in his work, cf. Allen 1980, 476, where she argues that Evagr. is correct in this assertion (doubted by Whitby, *loc. cit.*). Whereas the Latin translation of *CE* omits the letter of Amphilochius (and others), Mich. Syr. ix.5 (251–3c/144–8) offers a collection of extracts; cf. the citation in Leont. *Test.* 86.1841B (*CPG* 5965). Despite Whitby’s scepticism, there is no reason to suppose that Zach. did not include Amphilochius’ reply, which was in turn suppressed by PZ in the interests of brevity, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 158 n.310 and 585. On the Latin translation of the document, compiled at Cassiodorus’ request in south Italy, see Blaudeau 2006b, 157 n.114, who, following Schwartz, suggests that a later copyist

[claiming] that it was uncanonical. This man, who boldly made known the truth to the emperor with [statements] such as these concerning the Council, fell into danger because of the malice and deceit that the members of the Nestorian party had for him, as the only one of all the bishops who dared to find fault with the Council, the Tome, and the things that had occurred as a result of it. However, Aspar, who was a general at that time, even though he was an Arian, beseeched and begged [the emperor] not to let a priest such as him be threatened because he was speaking the truth. Thus Amphilochius was delivered from harm,⁸⁷ but the emperor, when he tried to correct the evils that had taken place in the days of Marcian, was hindered by the bishops, and because of them Timothy was also sentenced to be sent into exile at Gangra.⁸⁸ You will learn from this letter that he wrote to the emperor and that I have copied out below, that the [same] Anatolius, who was [bishop] in Constantinople, was the reason why the bishops declared these things [in response to] the encyclical of the emperor.

a. The eighth chapter makes known that in the letter of Anatolius to the emperor on the subject of the Council [of Chalcedon] he had influenced

suppressed Amphilochius' letter, along with many others.

On Amphilochius himself see PZ iii n.47 above. Joh. Nik. 88.19–20 mentions Eustathius of Beirut alongside Amphilochius as another opponent of Chalcedon in this context; a letter of his is attested at *ACO* ii.5, p.23.12, but it is not preserved (cf. n.98 below). Gray 1979, 22, observes that three other letters, of the bishops of Armenia I, Alypius of Caesarea and Epiphanius of Perge, also expressed reservations about Chalcedon; nevertheless, as he notes, a strong consensus favoured the status quo, cf. Frend 1972, 161–2, Grillmeier ii.1, 221–31/195–204, Brennecke 1998, 30–1 with *ACO* ii.5, pp.69–70, 75–7, 58–60.

87 As PZ states, Aspar seems to have favoured the opponents of Chalcedon, cf. Theoph. 112.4–5 with Krüger 1884, 84, 99–102, Schnitzler 1938, 18, 28, Blaudeau 2006a, 333. On the other hand, however, he had earlier favoured the return of Theodoret of Cyrrhus to his see, cf. Thdrt. *ep.* 140, ed. and tr. Azéma, vol.3, pp.148–50, Krüger 1884, 83. Schwartz 1934, 178, argues that Aspar acted thus in order to weaken the state church, since, as an Arian, he had no interest in seeing a strong, unified state church, cf. Frend 1972, 159. The Empress Verina appears also to have lobbied in favour of the anti-Chalcedonian position: see Devreesse 1930, 258, Blaudeau 2006a, 156 n.295 (following Pel. *Def.* 61). Anti-Chalcedonian sources tend generally to insist that there was much support for their position among the nobility, cf. *Hist. Diosc.* 271 and PZ iii n.89 above. Zach.'s description mitigates the blame attributed to Leo for Timothy's exile by involving the bishops, cf. n.49 above and Blaudeau 2006a, 462 n.6.

88 Timothy was exiled to Gangra, which had also received Dioscorus, at the end of 459 or at the start of 460: see Schnitzler 1938, 28, Frend 1972, 163. The bishops referred to are those who replied to the emperor's circular letter. The more vigorous pro-Chalcedonian position of Anatolius' successor, Gennadius, who took office in August or September 458, no doubt had a role in eliciting firmer action from the emperor, cf. Lebon 1909, 22, Frend 1972, 64–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 159–61.

[180] the bishops by writing [to them].⁸⁹

‘To the believing and Christ-loving Emperor, the Victorious Augustus, Leo Autocrator; Anatolius the bishop of Constantinople. It is a subject of prayer for me, Christ-loving and believing Emperor ...’ and a little further [down] he says, ‘Those things that were rashly carried out in Alexandria do not permit me to remain silent, but I, cleaving to the tranquil will of Your Majesty, which wills that the canons of our fathers not be despised, but also that the laws be upheld, as it is fitting for me, the priest of this, the city of Your Majesty, these things I have made known also to the venerable chief of the bishops, Leo, and to the chaste metropolitans who are under [your] authority. I mourn the canons that have been despised through the disgraceful actions of Timothy, as the records that have been sent concerning him to Your Majesty have made known: that he has trampled upon the head of ecclesiastical and secular laws, that he has loved vainglory, as Scripture says, “The wicked man behaves with contempt, even as he falls into the pit of evil ...”’⁹⁰ and the rest of what is in his letter. From this we can understand that he was the cause of the letters [sent] by the bishops to the Emperor, in which they agreed with what happened at the Council; but many of the senators and people of the city cut off communion with Anatolius when they learned these things about him.’⁹¹

a. Chapter Nine concerns the exile of Timothy and the things that happened upon his departure from Alexandria.

When the emperor’s order concerning the departure of Timothy had been sent to Alexandria, at this time also the general became distressed by this, and felt forced [181] to suffer many things rather than [have] the city lose this bishop. When he saw the killings with which the members of the party of Proterius threatened him, especially because some of them had taken refuge with the emperor,⁹² and that they were being helped by all of

89 The section quoted is *ACO* ii.5, p.25.4–15; the letter is no.141 in Grumel 197 (*CPG* 5960). As Schnitzler 1938, 17, 25–7, argues, Anatolius seems above all to have temporised rather than actively promoting adherence to the Chalcedonian line; his own presbyter, Atticus, supported Eutyches.

90 Proverbs 18.3.

91 See n.87 above on the alleged support for the anti-Chalcedonians among the aristocracy.

92 The supporters of Proterius were a powerful force in Constantinople: see Blaudeau 2006a, 155–6, underlining their close links with Anatolius. They were also in communication with Pope Leo, cf. his *ep.* 160 (*ACO* ii.4, 107–8), 173 (in *Coll. Avell.*, *ep.* 55, pp.123–4). The governor was thus placed in an unenviable position, unsure whether to protect the current patriarch, Timothy Aelurus, or to act against him; no doubt rumours circulated about his imminent removal before formal orders were received, thus exacerbating the situation.

the bishops, this general Stilas thought he and the bishop should take refuge in the baptistery of the Great Church.⁹³ There were two reasons for this: first, they would be spared; second, they would not be the cause of the destruction of human beings and of killings. When Timothy had taken refuge at the font of the baptistery, clerics from the party of Proterius, respecting neither the priesthood, the chastity, the seniority, the weakness, and the deeds of the man, nor the place in which he had taken refuge, pulled him from the font with [the help of] the army and dragged away the chief of the priests. When the people heard of this, there were more than ten thousand who were killed⁹⁴ there, in [their attempt] to snatch the priest from them.⁹⁵ When the soldiers had killed many of the Alexandrians, the man was led away and went out with the soldiers from Egypt to Palestine, along the [route] that runs along the coast of Phoenicia.⁹⁶ When the cities and their inhabitants in Palestine and along the seacoast heard, they approached to be blessed, and so that the sick among them might receive healing for their diseases by the grace of God that was attached to the man, they tore from his garments strips of material [as] protective [amulets].⁹⁷

93 On Stilas, see n.41 above and *PLRE* ii, Stilas. He was no doubt Dionysius' successor. The 'Great Church' is the Caesaron, on which see n.18 above. AK 317 insist that PZ is writing metaphorically here, i.e. that Stilas did not literally accompany Timothy into the baptistery (although there seems no reason to doubt this).

94 The text is corrupted, this word is a conjecture, following Brooks. Sebastian Brock has suggested to us that perhaps *rbw* was originally vocalized *rab(w)*, 'caused a commotion', and this was misunderstood as the word *rebu*, '10,000.' To this number 'deaths' was added, in order to harmonise this reading.

95 See Schnitzler 1938, 28–30, on Leo's decision to expel Timothy, which he connects to a meeting of the home synod in Constantinople under Gennadius; this is doubted by Blaudeau 2006a, 161. *Lib. Brev.* 15/103 states that Stilas was ordered to remove Timothy 'by all means', *modis omnibus*, which may explain the harshness here described. Blaudeau 2006a, 598 n.108, notes parallels between the violence here ascribed to the Chalcedonians and the atrocities of which the council's opponents were accused by the Proterian bishops: see *ACO* ii.5, p.14, cf. *Evagr.* ii.8 (p.58).

96 Blaudeau 2006a, 162, speculates that Timothy was evacuated by land rather than by sea because the sailors were among his supporters. As he also emphasises, Timothy's initial destination was Constantinople, in order to plead his case; only when he proved obdurate was his exile ordered. Clearly, however, he foresaw his fate, and the intervening trip to Constantinople soon disappeared from the tradition. See also Blaudeau 2006a, 305, on the close relations between Palestine and Egypt in this period.

97 Syr. *menaṣranê*, lit. 'protectors'. Blaudeau 2006a, 606 and n.154, argues that Zach. is echoing Mark 5.25–34, Christ's healing of the woman with the haemorrhage, which of course also took place in Palestine, cf. Mark 6.56. In general, cf. *ibid.* 608–9, Zach. emphasises the respect in which the patriarch of Alexandria was held.

b. When [Timothy] had reached Beirut, Eustathius the bishop urged the people of the city there to meet him with honour, and he beseeched him on behalf of the city to pray for it. [Timothy] stood in the middle of the city and made supplication for it and prayed to God [182] and blessed it.⁹⁸ Then Auxonius, the brother of Eustathius, who was at that time a professor of law,⁹⁹ on the advice of his brother stayed with him through the whole night, speaking earnestly about the faith and against Nestorius. Throughout all these [discussions] Timothy was silent and listened. When Auxonius had finished [speaking] at length after many [matters], Timothy said to him, ‘Who could convince me that these three fingers of mine should write on the paper of Chalcedon?’ When Auxonius heard [this] he became sad and wept.¹⁰⁰ Timothy, encouraging him and his brother Eustathius, who at the end was present, said to them, ‘Join me and may we do battle together on behalf of the faith and be victorious, so that either we shall receive our sees, or we shall be driven out into exile by those who are against [us] and shall dwell with God in sincerity.’ [Eustathius] held back on the pretext of the dedication of a church that he had built, a great sanctuary that was called ‘Anastasis.’¹⁰¹ Timothy said, ‘If we remain for the dedication of a sanctuary on earth, we will be driven out from the Jerusalem that is above, but if you are persuaded by me, we shall celebrate in the Jerusalem that is

98 As noted above (PZ iii n.87), Eustathius is portrayed by Zach. (and Joh. Nik.) as a stalwart opponent of Chalcedon. Yet as AK 317 note, a fragment of a work he wrote in favour of Leo’s Tome and against Timothy survives, PG 85.1803 (CPG 6718, also in Diekamp 1907, 96.10–97.6), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 591 n.54. Perhaps, like Amphilochius, his record was ambiguous (cf. PZ iii n.83 above), and Zach., having studied law in Beirut, may here be following local traditions favourable to him (as AK suggest), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 611–12.

99 Lit. ‘an interpreter of laws’. See PLRE ii, Auxonius (otherwise unattested) and Jones Hall 2004, 209–10. Beirut was a centre of legal studies in this period, *ibid.*, 210–13, where Zach. himself later studied, cf. Introduction B (1).

100 Auxonius seems to have tried to find common ground with Timothy, hence his criticism of Nestorius; his sadness may therefore have lain in Timothy’s refusal to perceive Chalcedon as untainted by Nestorianism. Chabot, translating Mich. Syr. ix.1 (244c/130–1) renders Timothy’s declaration as ‘Who will persuade me that these three fingers subscribed to the paper of Chalcedon?’ and takes it as referring to Eustathius, thus implying that Auxonius had persuaded him of his brother’s anti-Chalcedonian credentials. It is hard, in light of what we know of Eustathius, to be sure which of these different interpretations is the more likely; Brooks, PZT i, 182 n.3, restores the ‘my’, which is erased in MS A. Our text of PZ is not necessarily more reliable than the version preserved in Mich. Syr., cf. Introduction C (4).

101 I.e. ‘Resurrection’. Zach. describes the church in *De Opif. Mundi*, 47–72 with commentary at pp.197–8. He prayed there regularly when studying at Berytus, V. Sev. 48, 55 and see Introduction B (1). Zach. implies that Eustathius’ support for Timothy was luke-warm.

in heaven.' Timothy was similarly honoured all along the route to Gangra.¹⁰²

a. The tenth chapter is about another Timothy, who was the bishop from the party of Proterius, and who was called 'Wobblecap'.¹⁰³

Members of the party of Proterius, which [was backed by] the decree of the emperor and the leaders of the city who were obedient to the [emperor's] command, chose a man from among them who was also called [183] Timothy, 'Wobblecap,' and they sat him on the [episcopal] chair. He was a man of the people, and was meek in his character and frail in his actions, as what happened proved. When the people of the entire city left the church and assembled in the monasteries with the believing clergy, he was neither enraged nor distressed, but when his own clergy wanted to restrain the people through the Roman armed forces, he did not assent.¹⁰⁴

b. It happened that a woman met him as she was carrying her child, who had just been baptised and who was accompanied in procession by the faithful, as is the custom. His attendants became indignant at her, but he ordered them to bring her calmly to him. He took the child and kissed it, and urged its mother to take for him anything that she needed. He said to those who were with him, 'They are Christians and so are we, let every person believe as they will, and honour our Lord.'¹⁰⁵

c. Although he was doing these things, he did not make the anger of the people of the city abate, and without the soldiers he would not go about out of fear of the things that happened to Proterius. As much as they loved the believing Timothy [Aelurus], so much did they hate this [Timothy], and they never ceased from calling out and beseeching the emperor that Timothy should be restored to them from exile.¹⁰⁶

102 As noted above (n.96), Timothy went first to Constantinople, then to Gangra, cf. Krüger 1884, 102–3.

103 On the name see n.7 above. Henceforth we shall generally refer in the notes to Timothy Aelurus as Aelurus and Timothy Salophaciolus/Wobblecap as Wobblecap to avoid confusion.

104 Timothy Wobblecap was patriarch from mid-460 to November 475 and from July 477 until his death in 482. *Lib. Brev.* 16/105 also stresses the pacific nature of his reign. He had been in Constantinople after Proterius' death, but then returned to Alexandria at some point before his ordination. See Blaudeau 2006a, 162–4, for a detailed discussion.

105 An interesting case of a willingness to tolerate doctrinal differences, no doubt born of the relative weakness of Wobblecap's position. See further Streeter in Ste. Croix 2006, 242–51, on such cases.

106 Zach.'s insistence on Wobblecap's unpopularity contrasts with the more favourable portrait painted by other (admittedly Chalcedonian) sources, e.g. *Lib. Brev.* 16/105, 108, Th. Lect. 379 (= Theoph. 128.8–11). Acacius, *ep.* 8.2 in Thiel 1867, p.5.13–14 in Schwartz 1934, compares him to David in his mildness. See Grillmeier ii.4, 36–7/36–7, Blaudeau 2006a, 164 n.346.

d. They say concerning this Wobblecap that he tried to persuade the Alexandrians to be associated with him, and as though to reject the Council [of Chalcedon] he wrote in the diptychs the name of Dioscorus. When Leo of Rome heard these things, he forbade it.¹⁰⁷ On one occasion, when he went up to Constantinople, he had a great dispute before the emperor with Gennadius who was the bishop after Anatolius. [Timothy] said, 'I do not accept the Council, that it should make your see [of Constantinople] second after [184] that of Rome, and that it should profane the honour of my own see,' whereupon the emperor laughed when he saw them, and heard that the two priests were vying for preeminence.¹⁰⁸

e. And he wrote to give information to the [bishop] of Rome concerning this dispute, and he wrote on that occasion that it is fitting that each see should be restored to [the honour] that it had [had] earlier, and he made this known to the emperor. So much concerning this Timothy Wobblecap.¹⁰⁹
End of the tenth chapter.

a. The eleventh chapter, that [recounts] how Timothy was taken from Gangra to Cherson because of the hatred of the Chalcedonians against him.

Gennadius of Constantinople and those of his opinion did not cease to do evil to Timothy while he was in exile. They lobbied the emperor, and [he] commanded that [Timothy] go from Gangra to Cherson, where a barbarous and unpacified people dwell.¹¹⁰ The bishop of Gangra also agreed to this

107 Pope Simplicius alludes to this in letters written in 478 (*Coll. Avell.*, ep.61.3, p.139, 63.2, p.142, cf. 62.2, p.140); it is possible that Wobblecap inscribed the name of Dioscorus more than once. See Haas 1993, 301, Blaudeau 2006a, 164 n.344. One letter from Leo to Wobblecap survives, ep.171 (*Coll. Avell.*, ep.53, pp.120–1), of 18 August 460, but it contains no reference to this episode. There is no need to emend the reading of the text, as AK 318 propose, to replace 'Leo' with 'Simplicius'; Zach. is simply in error here.

108 The encounter is not otherwise attested but is possible, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 163, 406–8; the patriarchate of Constantinople fought hard to uphold Canon 28 of Chalcedon, which granted it this second rank. Gennadius was patriarch of Constantinople from 458 to 471 and the author of works highly critical of Cyril of Alexandria: see Diekamp 1938, 54–108 (including his works), Blaudeau 2006a, 384–6, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 189–96/166–72.

109 Pope Leo and his successors opposed the promotion of Chalcedon to a position of pre-eminence in the East, although Canon 28 specified that it remained inferior to Rome, partly no doubt because of the jurisdiction it accorded to Constantinople in the Balkans. It is natural therefore that Wobblecap should seek to make common cause with Rome. See Meyendorff 1989, 181–4, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 70–2, Blaudeau 2006a, 401–8.

110 Cherson, in the Crimea, near modern Sevastopol. See Blaudeau 2006a, 166 n.358, on the city in late antiquity with Jastrzebowska 2001, Blaudeau 2008b, 297 and n.129; despite Zach.'s assertion here, it appears to have been prospering. The date of his transfer from Gangra,

desire, out of envy for the believing, virtuous and wonderworking Timothy, the lover of the poor.¹¹¹ He was receiving gifts from Alexandria and Egypt and from the rest of the faithful, and he gave these liberally to the needy.¹¹² [Although] he embarked on the boat and set sail on a rough sea in the middle of winter, he arrived without harm in Cherson. When they learned the reason [for his arrival], the inhabitants admired him and became [adherents] of his faith, and were obedient to him.

b. But the party of Nestorius hated him because he was diligently and constantly writing censures and protests against the Council and the Tome, which he was sending to every corner in order to encourage the faithful, and supporting his words from holy Scripture and the teachers of the church from the preaching of Christ [185] until his own days.¹¹³ As a result of these [things], those who understood broke off from Gennadius of Constantinople and joined with Acacius, [who was] a priest and the Master of the Orphans,¹¹⁴ he who, in alliance with Timocletus¹¹⁵ the author, struggled against the party of the Nestorians. He composed verses which they sang and the people enjoyed [them], and they flocked in large crowds to the orphanage.¹¹⁶

where he incurred the bishop's hostility by his baptisms and meetings (Th. Lect. 380), is uncertain: Ebied and Wickham 1970, place it in 464, but, as Blaudeau 2006a, 166 n.357, notes, PZ does not establish their supposition. See also Blaudeau 2008b, 288 and n.89, on the need to remove him from Gangra.

111 AK 318 note that the bishop was Peter, who had signed the condemnation of Timothy, cf. *ACO* ii.5, p.87.29–30 with Blaudeau 2006a, 317.

112 Blaudeau 2006a, 318, notes how Aelurus was able to remain in touch with his supporters while at Gangra and attract supporters even there. Ebied and Wickham 1970 contains several letters that he was able to dispatch from Gangra, as they note, 327. According to the *Hist. Diosc.*, 288–95, Dioscorus, while in exile at Gangra, had similarly received support from Alexandrians, which provoked the displeasure of the local bishop.

113 See n.17 above on Aelurus' prolific output of polemic against Chalcedon, a considerable proportion of which was composed at Cherson, including his *Against the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon* (CPG 5482), partly ed. and tr. Ebied and Wickham 1985. Blaudeau 2006a, 167 n.361, discusses the chronology of Aelurus' output in detail, cf. *ibid.* 365–70. The last part of the phrase, it should be noted, is chronological in scope, indicating that Aelurus supported his arguments from works of the church fathers from the first to the fifth centuries A.D.

114 Syr. *'rpntrpws*, Gk. *orphanotrophos*.

115 The MS has 'the brother of Timocletus ...', which PZT i, 185.4, cf. PZV i, 128 n.1, corrects to the above reading on the basis of Mich. Syr. ix.1 (242b/127). Blaudeau 2006a, 168 n.367, following Redies 1997, 212 n.9, rightly argues that the MS reading is here in error.

116 Syr *'rpntrpywn*, Gk. *orphanotropheion*. Opposition to the Chalcedonian line pursued by Gennadius thus came to focus upon Acacius, who succeeded Gennadius in February 472. Th. Lect. 388 (cf. Theoph. 114.19–20) reports the compositions of Timocles (i.e. Timocletus),

c. Then the emperor ordered that the blessed Mary be proclaimed ‘Birthgiver of God’ and that it be written in the Book of Life, on account of which Martyrius, [the bishop] of Antioch who was an open Nestorian and who would not now consent to teach such things, was also deposed.¹¹⁷ Then Gregory of Nyssa was called by the emperor, a believing and virtuous man, of the same name as Gregory the Rhetor, to refute the teaching of the party of Nestorius.¹¹⁸ In those days some monks went up to the emperor on account of Martyrius. Gennadius had died, and Acacius the Master of the Orphans became [bishop] in his stead. He made a promise that he would annul the Tome of Leo, and the Council of Chalcedon, and the innovation of the faith and the additions [to it] that had taken place there.¹¹⁹

a. The twelfth chapter tells about Isaiah the bishop of Hermopolis and Theophilus the priest of Alexandria [who were] Eutychians,¹²⁰ and the letter

describing him as the anti-Chalcedonian rival of Anthimus, who composed for the supporters of the council. See Blaudeau 2006a, 168–9.

117 Peter the Fuller was ordained patriarch to replace Martyrius in 469, with the support of the future emperor Zeno, then *magister militum per Orientem*. On the nickname ‘Fuller’ or ‘Lauderer’ bestowed on Peter by his opponents, see Blaudeau 2006a, 576 n.435; it is never used by Zach. or PZ. Despite PZ’s assertion here, Martyrius resigned rather than be deposed, and then headed for Constantinople: see Th. Lect. 390 (= Theoph. 113.19–27) with Schwartz 1934, 182, Downey 1961, 485–7, Frend 1972, 167, Blaudeau 2006a, 170–1. Blaudeau 2006a, 454 and n.322 places the proclamation about Mary (also mentioned by Th. Lect. 395) in c.470 and attributes it to the patriarch Gennadius in an attempt to boost his own popularity in his struggles against the Arian Aspar; the measure may initially have been limited to the imperial capital, and only subsequently extended to Antioch, *ibid.* 343 n.409. His strategy will also have been to deflect the accusations of Nestorianism levelled at Chalcedon. PZ’s assertion, that Martyrius rejected this, is most implausible, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 170 n.375 but cf. *ibid.* 309 and n.280, on his unpopularity in Antioch. The insertion of this detail here is also somewhat puzzling; Evagrius, normally well informed on Antiochene matters, makes no mention of it. Zach., on the other hand, tends to offer little information on the see of Antioch, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 611–12, seeing in it an unreliable ally of the more important and orthodox patriarchate of Alexandria. On the ‘Book of Life’ see PZ iii n.111 above.

118 Nothing is known of this Gregory of Nyssa, a homonym of the fourth-century church father (here referred to as the Rhetor). See AK 319.

119 Gennadius died on 20 November 471; see above n.116 on Acacius’ succession. While this seemed to be a victory for opponents of the council, the new patriarch did little for the cause until the usurpation of Basiliscus, when the political circumstances changed drastically: see Blaudeau 2006a, 171–2. Redies 1997, 212 (cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 391–2) is sceptical of Zach.’s claim of a promise on Acacius’ part, but argues that it accurately reflected the view in his milieu in the capital (where Zach. himself arrived only three years after Acacius’ death).

120 Reading pl. for sg.

that Timothy [Aelurus] wrote concerning them to expose them.¹²¹

The [affairs] of the church of the imperial city were as follows. Timothy [Aelurus], while he was in exile, wrote not only against the adherents of Nestorius, but also against the Eutychians. [186] This is apparent from the [letters] he wrote to the Alexandrians and to the Palestinians¹²² against those who held the opinion of Eutyches, and who do not confess Christ to be consubstantial with us in the flesh, he who is consubstantial with the Father with respect to [his] divinity. He reported concerning Isaiah the bishop of Hermopolis, and concerning Theophilus the priest of Alexandria, who were dwelling in the Imperial City as though for love of money, that they were Eutychians. They [Isaiah and Theophilus] also reported concerning Timothy that he was of their opinion. [Timothy] wrote a letter concerning the teaching of Eutyches and Nestorius which he sent to [Constantinople] and signed with his name. When the bearers [of the letter] became known, they were treated with contempt by these men and exposed to danger, because those of the party of Isaiah said that they were deceivers. He [then] sent another letter concerning them, supporting it with citations from the fathers, which is as follows.¹²³

121 Isaiah, bishop of Hermopolis Parva in the Delta, was present at Ephesus II and at Chalcedon; only Zach. reports his subsequent career. See Blaudeau 2006a, 165 n.354. Nothing further is known of Theophilus, although in Aelurus' preserved letter (noted below), he is referred to as priest of the church of Theophilus (otherwise unknown). The first letter referred to by Zach., *CPG* 5476, does not explicitly mention Aelurus' opponents, as Ebied and Wickham 1970, 329, note, but it is almost entirely devoted to a refutation of the Eutychian heresy; it is preserved in BL Add. 12,156, fols.29^v-32^r. The later one, sent to Alexandria when Aelurus was at Gangra, is preserved in BL Add. 12,156, fols.32^v-34^r, tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 357-62 (*CPG* 5477) and is quoted *in extenso* below (sections hh-jj); it alludes to the earlier letter sent to them in Constantinople. See Grillmeier ii.4, 17-23/18-24, on Aelurus' struggles against the Eutychians, cf. Lebon 1909, 96-8, Blaudeau 2006a, 165-6.

122 The former refers to *CPG* 5477, for which see the preceding note. The latter has not survived, although Grillmeier ii.4, 20/20, implicitly identifies *ep.* 5 in Ebied and Wickham 1970, 364-6, to Faustinus (*CPG* 5480), with it (in which schisms in Palestine are noted).

123 Zach. thus inserts here two letters of Timothy Aelurus, *CPG* 5476-7. Note that Timothy's initial letter to Constantinople here mentioned, which is probably also referred to in hh below, is not recorded here or elsewhere; it was probably addressed to Isaiah and Theophilus themselves. Lebon 1909, 97-8, also notes the omission of this third letter, although he would place it after the one given directly below by PZ; this seems implausible, since Timothy appears to refer to it in this letter. Thus what we have immediately following here is a second letter (*CPG* 5476) which, according to the version in BL Add. 12,156, ed. and tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, fol.29^v (p.351) 'was written to the city of Constantinople'. At ff below, Timothy indicates that he is sending this letter to 'Your Charity', i.e. one particular individual, not a group. The most likely explanation for this apparent contradiction is that Zach. or PZ was using a copy of

b. The letter of Timothy. Our Lord and our God Jesus Christ, when he appeared in order to save us and to free us from the control of Satan, and to make us worthy of the good things of heaven, set down for us the law of those [things] that are pleasing to him through the holy fathers, and so that no one should think that by honouring [him] he insults his compassion, but rather accepting the [divine] economy of his humility, he commanded for the sake of our salvation the following, saying, ‘Do not stray to the right or to the left, but travel on the path of the Kingdom;’¹²⁴ and he also said, ‘Do not be too righteous, [187] and do not become wise lest you slip; do not slip much and do not be stubborn, lest you die before the time,’¹²⁵ [the meaning of] which is, may the Evil One not place in you anything contrary to my commandments and set a stumbling block for you on the path of the kingdom that you travel in order to kill you. For [this reason] he has said, ‘On the path of my travels they have buried traps for me.’¹²⁶ Therefore, watch yourself, and do not turn from the path of the Kingdom and wander off. For this is the will of the Evil One, that if you should accomplish much wickedness, he shall fall upon you, and you shall fall into danger.

c. For suppose someone tries to enter a city that is surrounded by water. If he tries to cross [the water] on foot he sinks and drowns in its depth, but if one is afraid to cross it, then one cannot enter the city. Now, if one should try [to cross] on a suitable ford, on this one crosses over and enters the city. It is the same also for us, who strive to enter the Jerusalem on high: unless we follow the law of God, which we have learned from the holy teachers, we shall not be able to stand on the rock of our guide Peter ‘the Rock,’¹²⁷

the letter sent elsewhere, to an individual: Timothy indicates in the letter (*loc. cit.*) that he has written likewise to Alexandria. There are some differences between the version he offers and that preserved in BL Add. 12,156, fols.29^v-36^v (noted above); this may naturally reflect the fact that in both cases we are dealing with (different) translations from Timothy’s original Greek. We also find a different selection of quotations in each version. Schwartz 1927b, 120–2, cf. Cavallera 1909, cross-references the quotations in BL Add. 12,156 and PZ with the Armenian translation of Timothy’s treatise against Chalcedon (on which see Ebied and Wickham 1970, 323 and Lebon 1927). At 121 n.1 he offers a detailed comparison of the versions of PZ and BL Add. 12,156, i.e. of which extracts are to be found in which text, since, as will be noted below, there are considerable divergences between them. Blaudeau 2006a, 366 n.496, suggests that Zach. consulted this collection of letters in the version contained in Aelurus’ *Church History* (on which see *ibid.* 367 and n.17 above).

124 Numbers 20.17, Deuteronomy 2.27, Proverbs 4.27.

125 Loose paraphrase of Ecclesiastes 7.16–18.

126 Ps. 139(140).6.

127 Thus translating Syr. *kepa*, which can have this implicit meaning.

the unshakeable one of the true faith, 'for you shall be called 'the Rock,' and on this rock I shall build my church, and the bolts¹²⁸ of Sheol shall not withstand it.'¹²⁹ [If] anyone is perverted by the Evil One to think that he is able to demolish the true faith, and if one contends, then one contends against one's own soul, [because] there is nothing than can topple [it], and this is the [meaning] of 'And the bolts of Sheol shall not withstand it.' Therefore, if one does not stand upon the truth of the faith, but is very righteous in thinking that one honours [it], one in fact insults [it]; [188] all the more unless one accepts the law of our Lord that has been set down to us through the holy ones, he ends up in visions of death, and at the mouth of Sheol. For we have learned that without the banner of the faith we are not able to become pleasing to God.

d. These [things] I have written because I have heard that some are contending and do not obey the law of our Lord, which has been handed down to us through the holy ones: that our Lord became consubstantial with us through his embodiment that was in the flesh that is from us; they have even condemned themselves if they do not [express] a similar opinion. Therefore, let no one, thinking they honour God, insult his mercy through not obeying the teaching of our holy fathers, those who said that our Lord Jesus Christ became consubstantial with us in the flesh, and was one with his flesh.¹³⁰ For I have heard the holy apostle who taught, 'Because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, thus he also [partook of flesh and blood], so that through his death he might abolish the power of death which is Satan, and free all those who were seized with and subjugated by the fear of death, so that they might live forever. For he did not take [his nature] from the angels, but from the seed of Abraham he took [it], and he deigned to become like his brothers in all things, so that he should be the merciful one, and a faithful priest before God, and absolve the sins of the people. For through him who suffered and was tempted, he is able to help those who are tempted.'¹³¹ For that [expression], 'He became like us in all things' teaches everyone who wants to become worthy of the good things of heaven and to

128 This is the Diatessaron reading (instead of 'gates'): see Murray 2004, 324–8.

129 Matthew 16.18. Zach.'s version is here more complete than BL Add. 12,156, fol.30^r, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 351 n.4; there are also some elements, however, that are absent from Zach., e.g. the reference to the earlier councils of Nicaea and Constantinople. Timothy cites the same passage in his refutation of Chalcedon, ed. and tr. Nau in *PO* 13 (1919), 222 (BL Add. 12,156, fol.40^r).

130 Cf. Leont. *De Sectis* 5, PG 86.1228 with Lebon 1908, 685, Blaudeau 1996, 120.

131 Hebrews 2.14–18.

be saved, that they must confess the embodiment¹³² of our Lord Jesus Christ, that it was from Mary the holy virgin, the Birthgiver of God, that he was to her a son of [human] nature and [is consubstantial] with us [189] in body, [and] that he is consubstantial with the Father in his divinity. For our fathers anathematised, and also we who cleave to them anathematise, those who are not of an opinion like them. We have copied in our letter below also their own citations, the truth of [their] teaching.

e. By Athanasius:¹³³ ‘For this the apostle wrote clearly, that “No one can lay another foundation *except the one that had been laid*,¹³⁴ which is Christ; let everyone see how he builds.”¹³⁵ It is necessary that a foundation such as this be in conformity with and in the likeness of those that are built upon it. God the Word, because he is the Word and the Only-begotten, has no peers who like him are divine, but because he became a human being and put on our body, we became consubstantial with him. Thus, in the things that are of our humanity he is the foundation, so that we might be able to be precious stones, be built upon him, and become a temple of the residence of the Holy Spirit.

f. For in the same manner that he is the foundation and we are the stones that are built upon it, so too is he the vine and we are the branches¹³⁶ that hang from it and in it, not in the nature of the divinity, for that is not possible, but rather in [the nature of] humanity. For it is fitting that the branches resemble the vine, because we too resemble him in the body that he took from us.’

g. ‘And¹³⁷ we confess that he is the Son of God and God in spirit, and a human being in body, and there are not two natures to one son, one that is

132 Syr. *metgaššemmuta*, lit. ‘embodiment’.

133 From his *Oratio II Contra Arianos*, ch.74, *PG* 26.304A-B, *CPG* 2093. In BL Add. 12,156, fol. 30^v, it is preceded by another (later) extract from the same oration, which in this version (rightly) follows this one.

134 This phrase is supplied by the editor and is found in BL Add. 12,156, fol.30^v, tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 353.

135 1 Corinthians 3.11, 10.

136 John 15.5.

137 This is a separate extract from ch.1 of Apollinarius’ letter to Jovian, which was incorrectly ascribed to Athanasius by Timothy’s day, *CPG* 3665. The Greek text may be found in *PG* 28.25–8, as also in Lietzmann 1904, 250.6–251.3; it is quoted likewise by Leontius, *De Sectis*, Act.8, *PG* 86.1256C, exposing the fraud, as too by Justinian, *Contra Monophysitas*, *PG* 86.1125A-B for the same reason. Another Syriac translation is preserved in *Athanasiana Syriaca*, part III, 147/103 (for this section). It was quoted already by Eutyches in his letter of appeal, who attributes it to a work of Cyril against Theodore, *Spic. Cas.* p.95.26–33 with Blaudeau 2006b, 145 n.24.

worshipped and the other that is not worshipped, but rather one nature of God the Word that became flesh and is worshipped with the flesh that he put on by one [act of] worship.'

h. [190] By the same, from the letter to Epictetus.¹³⁸ 'Now there are many who, hiding themselves and blushing, think that if we say that the body of our Lord is from Mary, in place of the Trinity we have introduced a Quaternity, and if we say that the body is of the same nature as that of the Word, then it remains a Trinity, without anything foreign being added to it. If we say that his body is human, then necessarily, because the body is foreign to the nature of God while the Word is in it, instead of a Trinity there must be a Quaternity, because of the addition of the body. Those who speak this way do not consider how they refute their [own] words and fall by them. For if they say that the body was not from Mary *but rather it was of the same nature as the Word*,¹³⁹ they too are shown to speak [of] a Quaternity no less than [if the body was] from something that is distinct. For just as the Son is consubstantial with the Father, he is not the Father but [rather] the Son in [his] *hypostasis*,¹⁴⁰ [yet] the Son is [still] consubstantial with the Father. Likewise, if the body is consubstantial with the Word, it is not the Word, but then it is another [fourth entity], and it is found according to their own words that the Trinity is a Quaternity. But the true and indivisible and perfect Trinity cannot accept addition, so then what do they suppose, and how are they Christians, who conceive of another other than the one who is God?'

i. [191] By the same, from the same letter.¹⁴¹ 'The body was in reality and in truth human in nature, the body of our Saviour was from Mary, because it was like our body, since Mary is our sister, because we are all from our father Adam.'

j. By Julius of Rome.¹⁴² 'There is not one change in the divine nature, for

138 *Ep. ad Epictetum* 8 in *PG* 26.1064B, *CPG* 2095, tr. McGuckin 1994, 386. As Ebied and Wickham 1970, 353 n.3 note, a Syriac tr. of this letter in its entirety survives, ed. and tr. R.W. Thomson, *Athanasiana Syriaca*, part I, 81/61. This translation is distinct, however. See also Camplani 1989, 44–7, 153–8 and Ebied and Wickham 1972 (on the other Syriac version of the letter).

139 Not found in the manuscript, supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.1 (245b/133) and from the Greek.

140 Syr. *qnuma*.

141 *Ep. ad Epictetum* 7, *PG* 26.1061B, tr. McGuckin 1994, 385, cf. *Athanasiana Syriaca*, part I, 80–1/60.

142 Apollinarius, *De unione*, 6–7, in Lietzmann 1904, 188.3–18, also in *PL* 8.874A, *CPG* 3646, Flemming and Lietzmann 1904, 18–19. Earlier editions are noted by Ebied and Wickham 1970, 354 n.1. On the circulation of Apollinarian forgeries see Schwartz 1927b, 96,

it does not diminish or increase; and when he says, ‘Glorify me,’ the voice is from the body and on account of the body. For the glory refers to all of him, because all of him is one. Moreover, the ‘Glory that I have for you from before the world existed’¹⁴³ made clear his divinity that it is glorified at all times, because this [glory] is proper to it, [even] if it was said as concerning all of him equally. Thus in spirit he is consubstantial with the Father invisibly, but because a body was also united to him in his nature, it is called equally with the [same] name. His divinity is also implied by the [same] name because it was united to our nature, but the nature of the body was not transformed into the nature of God through the union and through the partaking of the [same] name of the nature, just as the nature of God was not changed through the partaking of a human body and by the designation,¹⁴⁴ “a body consubstantial with us.”

k. By the same, from a letter to Dionysius.¹⁴⁵ ‘Those who confess that God who is from heaven became embodied from the virgin, and was one with his flesh trouble in vain those who say the opposite, as I have also heard, [namely that] there are two natures,¹⁴⁶ since John [the Evangelist] showed our Lord to be one when he said, “The Word became flesh,”¹⁴⁷ and Paul [said], “our Lord Jesus Christ is one, through whom [are] all things.”¹⁴⁸ For if [192] the one who was born from the virgin was named Jesus, and he is the one through whom all things came into being, [then] the nature is one, because he is one *hypostasis*¹⁴⁹ who is not divided into two, because the

cf. Cavallera 1909, 355–6; on the phenomenon generally in this context see Gray 1988. The same text is cited in another anti-Chalcedonian compilation, Cod. Vatic. gr. 1431, fol.303, cf. Schwartz 1927b, 31 (no.14). The second part is cited also in Leontius, *Adv. fraudem Apoll.* in PG 86.1961B, cf. Test. 1865B–D, exposing the forgery. For a detailed discussion of the extract and the suggestion that the original version, which underwent various modifications, might be genuine, see Tuillier 1987, 583–6.

143 John 17.5.

144 Syr. *mešammehuta*; the Greek is *onomasia* (in the dative).

145 *Ad Dionysium* 1, 2 in PL 8.929, 937, Lietzmann 1904, 257.7–19, Flemming and Lietzmann 1904, 35.8–16. This extract is omitted in BL Add. 12.156. It is, however, to be found in the Armenian version of Timothy’s work, *Widerlegung*, 364, cf. Schwartz 1927b, 115. It was also quoted by Eutyches, ironically, in his *libellus* of appeal, cf. Draguet 1931, 449–50, Camelot 1953, 238 with ACO ii.4, p.150.4–12 and *Spic. Cas.* p.92.

146 The text does not translate the clause that follows, ‘being excited against the words of impiety of those men.’

147 John 1.14.

148 1 Corinthians 8.6.

149 Syr. *qnuma* but in the Greek text it is *prosôpon* ‘person’ (Lietzmann 1904, 257.15) and in the Latin *persona* (ACO ii.4, p.150.10).

nature of the body that he had was not [separate] from him. Again, the nature of the divinity [did not exist] separately after the embodiment, but rather just as a human being [exists] in one nature from body and soul, so too he who was in the likeness of human beings is one, Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁰

I. By Gregory the Wonderworker.¹⁵¹ ‘Whoever says that Christ appeared in the world in fantasy, and does not confess that he came in the body as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says concerning the body of Christ that it had no soul and no mind, and does not confess that [his humanity] was perfect, as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says that Christ took part of a person, and does not confess that he became in our likeness in everything except for sin, let him be condemned. Whoever says that Christ was changeable or alterable, and does not confess that he was neither transformed in spirit nor was he corrupted in the flesh as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says that Christ was a perfect human being separately [apart from the divinity] and does not confess that our Lord Jesus Christ was one, let him be condemned. Whoever says that there was one who suffered and another who did not suffer, and does not confess that God the Word who [cannot] suffer suffered in his flesh as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says that the Son of God from before the world was one, and he who came to be afterwards, another, and does not confess that the one who is from before the world is the same as the one who came into being afterwards, as it is written, that “Christ is [193] yesterday and today,”¹⁵² let him be condemned. Whoever says that Christ was from the seed of a man like the rest of humanity and does not confess that he was from the Holy Spirit and [that] he took flesh from Mary the Virgin and was incarnate and became human from the seed of the house of David as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says that the body of Christ was consubstantial with his divinity, and does not confess that he is God from before the ages, who “emptied himself and took the likeness of a servant”¹⁵³ as it is written, let him be condemned. Whoever says that the body of Christ was not created, and does not confess that the uncreated God the Word received

150 Philippians 2.7–8.

151 *De fide capitula XII*, PG 10.1128–36, CPG 1772, also in ACO i.1.6, pp.147–8, another forgery, cf. AK 320, Cavallera 1909, 354. Timothy cites just ten anathemas, which correspond to 12, 11, 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 2 and 1 in the Greek (in that order). BL Add. 12,156, fol.31^v, offers a shorter extract. See also Ebied and Wickham 1970, 354 n.3, for other editions of the work. BL Add. 12,155, fol.114^v, cf. Wright 1871, 939, attributes the forgery to followers of Julian of Halicarnassus, an accusation belied by its deployment already here.

152 Hebrews 13.8; this quotation is not in the Greek.

153 Philippians 2.7.

from a human creature incarnation and humanity as it is written, let him be condemned. For how can one say the body was not created? For what is not created does not suffer, is not struck, and is not palpable. When Christ rose from the dead, he showed to the disciples the scars from the nails, the wound from the spear and the palpability of his body. Although the doors were shut, he entered, in order to show the power of the divinity, and the reality of his body.¹⁵⁴ For the flesh that [came into being] after some time cannot be said to be consubstantial with the divinity which is from eternity; for “consubstantial” [in this context] is something which is without change in nature and property.

m. By the same.¹⁵⁵ ‘It was the true and incorporeal God who appeared perfect in the flesh with perfect divinity, not two *hypostaseis* and not two natures. For we do not worship four: God, the Son of God, a human being, and the Holy Spirit; [194] but rather we condemn those who act so wickedly, and who also place a human in the glory of God. For we say that the Word of God become a human being for our salvation, so that we might take the likeness that is from heaven and become deified¹⁵⁶ through the likeness of the one who in true nature is the Son of God, [and who is] in human flesh our Lord Jesus Christ.’

n. By Basil of Caesarea.¹⁵⁷ ‘That which is made is not of the [same] nature as its maker, but he who is born is of the same essence¹⁵⁸ as his begetter. Thus they are not [the same], that which is created and one who is begotten.’ And again, ‘With children, one is of the [same] nature as the parent, even if he is born in a different way [from the parent]. For Abel, who was born from copulation, was not different from Adam, who was not born but formed.’ And again, ‘If they who are different in their manner of creation are different in their essence¹⁵⁹, then human beings do not resemble one another in nature, because the creation of Adam, who was fashioned from the earth, was different, and the creation of Eve that was from the rib [of

154 These sentences, starting at ‘For how...’ stand at the start of the extract in the original, cf. AK 320 with PG 10.1128A.

155 From the *Fidei Expositio* wrongly ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus, but in fact by Apollinarius (CPG 3645), PG 10.1117, quoted also in part by Eutyches, *Spic. Cas.* p.96.14–23, cf. Nau 1910, 280, where it is also quoted in a letter attributed to Nestorius and rejected as Apollinarian.

156 MS and Mich. Syr. ix.1, 247b/137: ‘and that He took our likeness upon Him’ (so HB 88), Gk., ‘[so that] we should receive what is heavenly and become deified.’

157 *Adversus Eunomium*, a spurious work (CPG 2837), PG 29.673, 680, 681.

158 ‘wsy’, Gk. *ousia*.

159 ‘wsy’, Gk. *ousia*.

Adam] is different, and [the creation] of Abel from copulation was different, and [the creation of] the one who alone was born from Mary, the virgin, is different. The same [holds] concerning the birds and concerning livestock.’

o. By Gregory [of Nyssa], his brother.¹⁶⁰ ‘For the nature of those who are born must be that of those who begot them.’

p. By Gregory of Nazianzus.¹⁶¹ ‘These [things] are what is common to the one who is above us [who] took these [attributes] that belong to us for our sake and [to the one who] became a human being, not for him to be limited by a body to just [one] body – [195] rather, he is unlimited, because his nature is incomprehensible – but rather in order to sanctify with it [all] humanity. He became like leaven to the whole lump, and drew it to himself, and the one who had become guilty he released from his guilt. In all things for all of us he became like us except for sin: body, soul, mind; these [elements] that constitute an ordinary mortal human. He who appeared is God, [so as to be] intelligible, but [he is] a human being because of Adam and the virgin from whom he became [flesh]. He was older than the former, while the other was his mother according to the law, who gave birth to him supernaturally [and] not according to the [natural] law.’

q. By Julius of Rome.¹⁶² ‘Again, with respect to the [divine] economy of our Saviour in the flesh, we believe that God the Word became flesh, while continuing without change, in order to renew humanity. While he is the true Son of God [by] eternal generation, he became human through his birth from the Virgin. He is one, being perfect God in his divinity and consubstantial with the Father, and perfect human through the birth from the virgin, and consubstantial with human beings in body. Whoever says that Christ had a body from heaven, or that the body is of his [divine] nature, let him be condemned. Whoever does not confess that the flesh of our Lord was from the virgin [and] of our nature, let him be condemned. Whoever says concerning our Lord and Saviour, who was from the Holy

160 *Oratio Catechetica* 38, PG 45.100C (CPG 3150), also ed. Mühlenberg, p.100.7–8.

161 *Oratio Theologica* iv.21, PG 36.132A–B (CPG 3010), also in *Discours*, ed. and tr. P. Gallay, pp.270–2.

162 The same extract, CPG 3705, attributed instead to Vitalis, *De Fide*, is quoted by Cyril of Alexandria in *De recte fide ad dominas*, PG 76.1216 (= ACO i.1.5, pp.67.29–68.11), cf. Lietzmann 1904, 273.6–25 (with 152), Flemming and Lietzmann 1904, 54.24–55.6, Pusey 1868–77, vol.7, 165. Schwartz 1927b, 99, suggests that the reading Julius, rather than Vitalis, was a scribal error; in BL Add. 12.156, fol.7^v, it is given correctly, cf. Schwartz 1927b, 118, Wright 1871, 641. The citation bears some similarity to the Apollinarian Letter of Timothy to Prosdocius, for which see Lietzmann 1904, 283–6. On the context of Vitalis’ definition see Chadwick 2001, 424.

Spirit and from Mary the Virgin in flesh, that he was a mere [human being], was not conscious, was without reason, and was without mind, let him be condemned. Whoever dares to say that Christ suffered in his divinity and not in the flesh as it is written, let him be [196] condemned. Whoever separates and divides our Lord and Saviour and says that God the Word is one son, and the human whom he took another, and does not confess that he is one and the same, let him be condemned.'

r. By John Chrysostom.¹⁶³ 'He who transcends all minds and conquers all thoughts, and is higher than the angels and all intelligent powers, wished to become a human being, and took flesh, which was formed from the earth and clay, when he entered the virginal womb and was conceived, for a time of nine months after which he was born and sucked milk, and suffered all of the things that humans [do].'

s. By the same.¹⁶⁴ 'Why was he called a table? Because when I eat the mysteries that are upon him, I become refreshed. Why was he called a house? Because I dwell in him. Why was he called a resident? Because I am a temple for him. Why was he called a head? Because I have become one of his members. Again, when he desired the harlot,¹⁶⁵ what did he do? He did not call her up, for he did not want to bring a harlot up to heaven, rather he went down below, because she could not come up. He descended to her below, and came to her hut and he was not ashamed. He found her while she was drunk. How did he come? Not in his nature openly, but rather he became like the harlot was, in nature but not in will, so that when she saw him she would not tremble, and running off become distant [from him]. He came to her having become a human being. How did he become [a human being]? He was conceived in the womb, and grew little by little.'

t. [197] By the same.¹⁶⁶ 'This is the day on which the one who is from eternity was born, and he became a human being, something which he was not, while he was not changed from that which he was, God. For it was not

¹⁶³ *Monitum ad homiliam ad illud, Pater, si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste* = *Homilia in Matt. xxvi.39*, ch.3, in *PG* 51.37 (*CPG* 4369); it is also quoted in BL MS Addit.12,156, fol.32^r, tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 357.

¹⁶⁴ In fact, from the spurious *Homilia de capto Eutropio et de divitiarum vanitate*, ch.8, in *PG* 52.403 (*CPG* 4528).

¹⁶⁵ This section comes from the same work, ch.11, *PG* 52.405. It is also quoted in BL Add. 12,156, fol.32^r, tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 357. The allusion to the harlot is obscure.

¹⁶⁶ In fact, from Chrysostom's *In salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi Nativitatem Oratio* ch.1, *PG* 56.386 (*CPG* 4560), a work also be found in Syriac in MS Vat. Syr. 253, cf. Sauget 1968, 325–6 no.2.

by a change in the divinity that he became human, neither did he become God from human development, but rather being the Word that does not suffer, he became flesh but his nature was not changed.¹⁶⁷ He who is seated on the throne on high and is exalted was laid in a manger. He who is simple, bodiless, and impalpable was embraced by human hands. He who severs the chains of sin was wrapped in swaddling bands.'

u. By Athanasius.¹⁶⁸ 'If someone teaches what is outside of holy Scripture and says that the Son of God is different from the one who became a human being from Mary, who became the Son through grace, like us, so that there would be two Sons, one who is God of the [same] nature as God, and one who is through grace the human being from Mary, and whoever says that the body of our Lord was from above and was not from the Virgin Mary, or that the divinity was changed into flesh, or that it was confused or altered, or that the divinity of our Lord suffered, or that the body of Christ should not be worshipped, as being from human beings, even though the body of our Lord and our God is [deserving] worship: such a person we condemn, adhering to the apostle who says, 'Whoever preaches to you a gospel different from the one that we have preached, let him be condemned.'"¹⁶⁹

v. By Bishop Ambrose.¹⁷⁰ 'He is the same person who speaks, but not [198] in [the same] way every time, but rather one observes in him now the glory of God, now the human sufferings. As God he teaches divine things, because he is the Word; and as a human he teaches human things, because he was speaking with our nature.'

w. By Theophilus of Alexandria.¹⁷¹ 'The Word, the living God, the

167 This last section comes from the same work, ch.2, *PG* 56.389.

168 From the conclusion of Apollinarius' letter to Jovian, *PG* 28.28D-29A, from which Timothy quoted above, n.137, for which see Lietzmann 1904, 253.3-14 for the Greek, cf. *Athanasiana Syriaca*, part III, 149/104.

169 Galatians 1.8-9.

170 From *De fide*, 2.9, pp.84-5, *PL* 16.600B = *ACO* ii.1.1, p.22.21-4 (quoted by Pope Leo in texts to back up his Tome). This extract is to be found in BL Add. 12,156, fol.31^v, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 355.

171 The first part comes from *Fragmenta Graeca epistolarum paschaliūm*, ep.6, in *PG* 65.60C (*CPG* 2589); the provenance of the remainder is uncertain, cf. AK 321. In BL Add. 12,156, in which only the last part (from 'he was born as a human being') is preserved, the extract is said to be from Theophilus' 21st festal letter, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 355. They also note, 347, that an Arabic version of this passage may be found in MS Cambridge Add. 3288, cf. Wright 1901, 923. A similar passage, said to be from the sixth paschal letter, is quoted in the acts of Ephesus I (session of 22 July 431), a series of extracts read by the head notary Peter in order to vindicate the decisions taken, *ACO* i.5, p.93, quoted at Chalcedon, *Acts Chalced.* 1.917 (10) (*ACO* ii.3.1, p.206).

Lifegiver of all¹⁷², the creator of the worlds, did not put on a heavenly body like an expensive material and come to us, rather he demonstrated in clay the greatness of the skill of his craft. When he renewed and repaired humanity that had been formed from clay, he was born as a human being from the virgin, while he developed in all things that belong to [our nature]¹⁷³ except sin, and when he had been [born] through a miraculous sign he appeared to us and blessed human nature.’

x. By the same.¹⁷⁴ ‘However, the first human being came into existence in a very different manner from us, because the contact and intercourse of man and woman did not effect his creation. And if they allow that through the will of God [Adam] came into being out of the earth, no parents having served his birth through the coupling of male and female, why do they argue over the embodiment of our Lord and Saviour from the virgin? When they say this to oppose us, we say to them, what is easier – for a person to come into being from the earth without parents, or for Christ our Saviour to be born in a sentient fashion from the virgin with flesh and a soul? The first human being, who came into being from the earth, partook in the entire [199] human likeness, with flesh and blood. Our Saviour through his [own] power created for himself and prepared an ensouled and sentient body from the virgin with flesh and blood. We confess that he walked around with human beings, even though the pleasure and intercourse of man and wife were not intermediaries in his holy embodiment.’

y. By the same.¹⁷⁵ ‘For it was not difficult for God the Word to erect a temple for himself from a virgin body for our salvation. Consider that even [as] God is never polluted by the copulation of [our] nature when he creates human beings, so too when he took flesh from virgin blood through his mercy for our salvation.’

z. By Cyril.¹⁷⁶ ‘Thus in truth when the Birthgiver of God gave birth to Christ through a miracle, she remained a virgin. He who like us partook of flesh and blood was of our own nature in his flesh, not in his own nature

172 Variant: ‘the one who acts as a kinsman to all’.

173 Lit. ‘made progress’.

174 According to BL Add. 12,156 this extract comes from Theophilus’ 22nd festal letter (not otherwise known, *CPG* 2590), cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 355.

175 From Theophilus’ 24th festal letter, *CPG* 2591, also quoted by Severus in *Pol.* part I, 168/130, part IIB, 304/266.

176 From Cyril’s fragmentary homilies, to be found in *PG* 77.1093B, *CPG* 5259, also quoted in Schwartz 1927b, 14.27–32, cf. Hespel 1955, ch.19, p.118; it does not feature in BL Add. 12,156. A similar line of argument may be found in Cyril’s refutation of Theodoret’s criticisms of his anathemas, *ACO* i.5, p.253.32–5.

as the heretics say, but our nature, because it said, “He took the seed of Abraham.”¹⁷⁷

aa. By the same.¹⁷⁸ ‘We say that his own body belonged to the Word, and was not that of another human being, distinctly and separately, it being thought that Christ is not the Son. Just as the body of each one of us we say is one’s own, so do we reason concerning the one Christ; and although he took a body from our race and our nature because he was born from the virgin, it is held and stated that it is his own body; and because God the Word is Life in his own nature, he showed his body [to be] lifegiving, and in this matter we have a lifegiving blessing.’

bb. [200] By the same.¹⁷⁹ ‘Otherwise, how was he like us, although he remained God the Word as he was before? However, grant to him [that] by the unity of the *hypostasis* his body is not separate, and do not disrobe him of his flesh. Therefore I worship correctly the one Son, consubstantial with the Father in divinity, consubstantial with us in humanity. Those who delight in believing these things, Christ will clarify and enlighten their knowledge by his mysteries.’

cc. By the same.¹⁸⁰ ‘It is right for us to say and hold that God the Word was sent forth and became a human being, consubstantial with us, but remained consubstantial with the Father. He was and remained as he was, and although he became a human being he was not transformed. He was sent to announce to the captives salvation and [to give] light to the blind.’¹⁸¹

dd. By the same, from the letter to Succensus.¹⁸² ‘They say that if Christ is perfect God and a perfect human being, and the same one is thought to be consubstantial with the Father in divinity and consubstantial with us in humanity, how can he be perfect if the human nature is not seen? And how

177 Cf. Hebrews 2.16.

178 From *Apologeticus pro duodecim capitibus adversus orientales episcopos* in PG 76.372D-374A, also in ACO i.1.6, pp.58.35–59.5 (CPG 5221).

179 In BL Add. 12,156, 31^r, this extract is said to be ‘from the second book of blessed Cyril Archbishop of Alexandria’s work against Theodore’, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 356. It is also quoted in Hespel 1955, ch.195, p.193, where it is ascribed to the third book against Theodore, cf. Pusey 1868–77, vol.3, 525.

180 From *Contra Nestorium* iii.3, ACO i.1.6, p.65, PG 76.141C (CPG 5217). The last sentence is a quotation from Nestorius himself, ACO i.1.6, p.65.11–12, whereas the preceding sentences come from a little further down.

181 Luke 4.18.

182 From *Ep.2 ad Succensum* (CPG 5346), 4, ed. and tr. Wickham 1983, 88–91, tr. McGuckin 1994, 361–2 (PG 77.241D-244A), cf. another Syriac version in Cyr. Coll. 50/41. The extract is also quoted by Leontius, *Test.* 1813B.

can he be of the [same] nature as ours if this *hypostasis*¹⁸³ that is our nature is not seen? The solution that we have given above at the beginning suffices for their understanding. If when we said “One nature of the Word” we omitted “became flesh,” rejecting the [divine] economy, their word would be plausible, [when they ask], “How is he perfect in humanity and in [divine] nature?” Since also [201] our word “he became incarnate”¹⁸⁴ makes known that he was perfect in humanity and in [divine] nature, let them desist and not lean upon a broken reed.’¹⁸⁵

ee. By the same.¹⁸⁶ ‘He took the hand of the daughter of Jairus by the authority of his divinity and said, ‘Little girl, stand up.’¹⁸⁷ He did not command her with a word alone, although the act was accomplished according to his will, but he performed an action, so that we might believe that his holy body was of the [same] nature as our body, [although] it was honoured and divine, and exalted over our stature, while [still] being his own, and because of this he called his body ‘the bread of life.’”

ff. Therefore, these fathers of ours and holy ones like them condemned unanimously anyone who does not accept their teaching. I have written to Alexandria, to the clergy, to the monks, to the monks and virgin sisters in Christ, and to the believing laity. I have also sent the letter to Your Charity,¹⁸⁸ so that you may know what I have written. I, Timothy sign the salutation with the signature of my hands. Whoever does not believe according to the tradition of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, which our holy fathers have taught, let him be condemned. Either it is right for us to stand in the faith and live in it, or to die for it and live forever. The priest and my brother Anatolius,¹⁸⁹ the deacons Theophilus, Cyrus, Christodorus, and Gennadius, and the brotherhood that is with me ask for your welfare.’¹⁹⁰

183 Syr. *qnuma*, yet the term in Cyril is Gk. *ousia* (essence).

184 One word only in the original Greek, *sesarkōmenēn*.

185 Isaiah 36.6.

186 The last part of this quotation may also be found in Pusey 1868–77, vol.3, 479–80; it is cited by Justinian, *Adversus Monophysitas*, PG 86.1124B, where he attributes it to the otherwise unpreserved *Libri contra Synousiastas* (CPG 5230).

187 Mark 5.41, Luke 8.54.

188 On the question of the addressee of the letter see n.123 above.

189 Here meant literally: Timothy’s brother was called Anatolius and accompanied him in exile. As PZ relates at v.4, Timothy later sent his remains, along with those of Dioscorus, to Alexandria. Timothy mentions him in his *HE*, PO 13 (1919), 206 with Nau’s n.1.

190 Leontius, *Actio* 8.3, PG 86.1257B, refers to a presbyter Cyrus who offered Timothy advice on scriptural citations when he was writing against Chalcedon, cf. Nau in PO 13 (1919), 102–3. The others are not otherwise known.

gg. We have copied this letter above and the citations that are in it so that reading and considering what is in it [202] the lovers of the teaching may find that it sufficiently refutes the opinion of Nestorius, who speaks of two natures in the unity of Christ, and the teaching of Eutyches, who does not confess that God the Word became a perfect human being, and [that] God the Word possessed without change one *hypostasis* who became flesh.

hh. Again, we have written this letter and what follows it to make known how those who repent and turn away from heresy should be received.¹⁹¹

The letter of Timothy that he wrote to Alexandria through which he cut off Isaiah and Theophilus from the communion of the faithful.¹⁹²

‘Timothy to the God-loving bishops, priests, deacons, and abbots; and to the brotherhoods and to the believing people, peace in our Lord. Because Isaiah and Theophilus have been secret heretics for a long time, I admonished them in letters¹⁹³ to agree to the holy teaching of our fathers, but they were not persuaded by the letters that I wrote to them, to Constantinople, with demonstrations that were from Scripture and from the teachers of the church, that our Lord Jesus Christ became consubstantial with us in body. They are not ashamed of our exile from one place to another;¹⁹⁴ rather they acted maliciously towards the bearers of our letter. Moreover, they have informed the prefects¹⁹⁵ concerning them, and they have incited others, saying, ‘It is a forgery!’¹⁹⁶ while knowing my signature was on it. We waited for them for no short while, though we had learned of their intention, but they did not reply to us, neither in word nor in writing. Again, the thought occurred to me that it was best to write to them, and we wrote imploring them to show compunction and confess the faith [203] that is true. I reminded them that God neither rejects nor casts aside those who repent. I demonstrated that even holy persons such as David, Peter, and Paul had sinned and denied our Lord, and that afterwards they showed compunction, and God accepted their repentance, and judged them worthy of their former dignity.

ii. We wrote to them things such as these, that if they showed compunction and confessed that the body of Christ was consubstantial with us, we

191 This is *ep.* 2 in Ebied and Wickham 1970, 357–62, i.e. BL Add. 12,156, fols.32^r–34^r. See section a above on the circumstances of its composition.

192 BL Add. 12,156, fol.32^r, adds that the letter was written from Gangra, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 357.

193 On the probable sequence of letters, not all of which are preserved see n.123 above.

194 An allusion probably to Timothy’s somewhat indirect journey to Constantinople via Palestine (rather than the move to Cherson), so Lebon 1909, 97.

195 Syr. *hwprkw*, Gk. *hyparchoi*.

196 Syr. *plsws*, Gk. *phalsos* < Lat. *falsus*.

would continue in the love of our friendship towards them, and we would keep them in the honour of their rank; but they were not friendly to us, rather they treated us with contempt. I waited again four years, [during which time] I did not expose them by their names, but they could not be persuaded and did not show compunction, and accepted neither the teaching of our holy fathers nor us. Adhering to some of the heretics who openly say that our Lord did not take a human body, and did not become from [one of] us a perfect human being, they creep from house to house and are seized by the love of money and the belly, which they think is their God.¹⁹⁷ While they were dwelling in the imperial city we wrote to them to depart from there, but they did not want to, as they were leading simple people astray and spreading other rumours against us so that they could do various evils to us. Being distressed and saddened over them, I am compelled to excommunicate them by their names so that they may not cause many to stumble and lead [them] astray.

jj. I make known the following [concerning] Isaiah and Theophilus, who say that the body of our Lord was of his own [divine] nature, and was not from our own, and that he did not become human in reality, and have made themselves foreign to the communion of our holy fathers and to us: let no one associate with them, because John the Evangelist commands, “My brothers, do not believe all spirits, but test the spirits if they are from God, [204] because many false prophets have appeared in the world, and by this a spirit is known as being from God: every spirit that confesses Jesus Christ came in the flesh is from God; every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God, and this is the spirit of the false Christ,”¹⁹⁸ “Because many deceivers have gone out into the world, those who do not confess that Jesus Christ came in the flesh – this [sort of person] is the deceiver and the false Christ.”¹⁹⁹ And again, “If one comes to you and does not preach this teaching, do not accept him in the house, and do not answer his greeting. He who answers his greeting is a partaker in his evil deeds.”²⁰⁰ And because of the apostle who says, “Whoever preaches to you other than what we have preached to you, let him be condemned, whether it is an apostle or an angel from heaven,”²⁰¹

197 2 Timothy 3.6; Philippians 3.19. The four years will have elapsed (presumably) between 459/60 and 463/4, cf. Lebon 1909, 98. The date of Timothy’s transfer to Cherson is uncertain: see n.110 above.

198 1 John 4.1–3.

199 2 John 1.7.

200 2 John 1.10, 11.

201 Galatians 1.8–9.

I am innocent of their blood and [the blood of those] who associate with them. For I have not ceased to show them according to the will of God what is useful for them, because Paul advises [us], saying “After you admonish the heretic once or twice and he does not accept [it], avoid him because he is corrupted and guilty while continuing to sin.”²⁰² The blessed Dioscorus also wrote things agreeing to these [teachings] of our holy fathers in the letter to Secundinus concerning such matters.’²⁰³

kk. And the rest of the letter: ‘I beseech you, my brothers in our Lord Jesus Christ and in the love of the Spirit, as I have written in a letter from last year concerning those who repent from the dyophysite heresy, you are to help them and extend to them a hand in our Lord: you bishops, clergy, and the rest of the faithful. All those who are subject to you, each one who [205] repents, after one year of his penance restore him to his rank and let his honour be given [back] to him. If there is no faithful bishop, let any faithful clergy or bishops who are to be found in the region on whatever occasion take his place through the love of our Lord, even if those who repent are not subject to [their] authority. Cyril and Dioscorus observed this same order and regulation of one year’s penance for bishops, priests, and deacons who returned, and then they were restored to their former rank.²⁰⁴ Pray for us that God may help us in this struggle. Our Lord be with you. Amen.’

ll. He was writing letters such as these and advising how to receive those of the party of Proterius and became so well known even among the people of India that after their bishop had died they sent to him a request that he make [someone] a bishop for them, because they were of his faith.²⁰⁵ All the while the Alexandrians did not stop the protests and the petitions that they were sending time after time to the emperor on [Timothy’s] behalf, and they were fomenting sedition,²⁰⁶ for when they learned that [Emperor] Leo had just died and Basiliscus had become [emperor] after him, they sent some

202 Titus 3.10, 11

203 Quoted *in extenso* by PZ at iii.1h-i. Not only does PZ omit the quotation but also approximately one page of Timothy’s own writing, cf. Ebied and Wickham 1970, 360–2.

204 See n.39 above for the difficulties experienced by Timothy in insisting upon this moderate line for receiving former opponents.

205 Otherwise unattested. As AK 322 note, ‘India’ is a vague term and might well refer here to Arabia Felix. Blaudeau 2006a, 167 n.360, suggests rather that it refers to Ethiopia, which traditionally fell within the orbit of the patriarch of Alexandria. As Blaudeau 2006a notes, 166–7, Aelurus was able to maintain some contact with his supporters even in Cherson, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 26 (p.63), which records a visit paid to him by Apollo of Caesarea.

206 Lit. ‘making sedition,’ Gk *stasis*. On the frequent deputations to Leo see Blaudeau 2006a, 337.

skilled monks: Paul the Sophist, James, and Theopompus.²⁰⁷

mm. The chiefs of the bishops from the Council of Chalcedon until Basiliscus and the *Encyclicon* that he made, and Marcus²⁰⁸ and the reign of Zeno as emperor, were these:²⁰⁹ of Rome, Leo and after him Hilary;²¹⁰ [206] of Alexandria, Proterius, who was murdered, and after him Timothy the Great, who was banished, and until he returned [at the time of] the *Encyclicon* they made another Timothy [bishop], the one who is called ‘Wobblecap’; in Constantinople: Anatolius, after him Gennadius, and after him Acacius; in Ephesus, John who took the place of Bassianus, and Paul who was banished, and who returned [at the time of the] *Encyclicon*, and was then banished again; in Antioch, Domnus, and after him Maximus, and after him Martyrius, who was deposed, after him Julian, after him Stephen, after him another Stephen who was deposed,²¹¹ then Peter, who returned from exile two or three times;²¹² in Jerusalem, Juvenal and his successor Anastasius. Then Emperor Leo died, and after him arose Basiliscus, Marcus, and Zeno, who had departed to the fortress of Salmon²¹³ for a short time, but who returned and became emperor, whereupon Basiliscus and Marcus were expelled.

207 See PZ v.1a for more detail on these individuals. They were probably sent in order to lobby Basiliscus, as PZ says here (*contra* v.1), on Aelurus’ behalf, rather than Zeno (the immediate *de facto* successor of Leo in 474).

208 The son of Basiliscus and his wife Zenonis, designated Augustus by his father, killed upon Zeno’s return in 476. See *PLRE* ii, Marcus 4.

209 See appendix 2 for information on the tenure of eastern patriarchs in this period. The patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople are sufficiently discussed elsewhere in this book and the next; on the bishops of Ephesus see PZ iv.5 above. This brief chronological overview covers books iii–v (451–476) and may (unlike that at the end of iii) derive from Zach. Mich. Syr. ix.4 (248–9c/141–2) has a similar but more detailed list, which adds the number of the bishop in the succession to the patriarchates. PD ii, 2/1–2, has a very similar list, cf. Witakowski 1996a, 1 n.4 and Introduction C (3)(iii).

210 This is correct: pope Leo died in 461 and was succeeded by Hilary (461–8), then Simplicius (468–83): see Fraisse-Coué 1998b, 161–2.

211 See Introduction C (3)(iii) and n.36 on this. Blaudeau 2006a, 195 n.532, following Duffy in *Syn. Vet.* 101, p.86, suggests that PZ (and Th. Lect.) are correct in distinguishing two Stephens, the first of whom died of natural causes (*contra* Stein 1949, 21 n.1). On the successive patriarchs of Antioch see Maraval 1998b, 116–18, *HEO*, 683, 688, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 195–6 and n.117 above; also v.5b below.

212 I.e. Peter the Fuller, on whom see n.117 above and PZ v below.

213 See PZ vii n.18.

BOOK FIVE

a. Book Five, which contains these twelve chapters that are marked out separately below, gives information concerning Basiliscus and Marcus the Most Illustrious,¹ and concerning their encyclical letters which they wrote to the bishops under their authority, in which they condemned the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome [of Leo]. Timothy the Great returned from exile after eighteen years in Gangra and Cherson, and arrived in Constantinople. Then he and those skilled monks of his, [207] Paul the Sophist, James, and Theopompus, persuaded Basiliscus in regard to the *Encyclicon*. [It also gives information] concerning the written petition sent by the bishops of Asia who had assembled at Ephesus and had signed the *Encyclicon*.²

b. [This book also describes] the Eutychian monks who were found in Constantinople and who, along with the emperor's wife Zenonis,³ plotted against Timothy to expel him again into exile, but he [Timothy] withdrew to Ephesus and reinstated Paul there [as bishop of Ephesus] through a synod that [he] assembled, and gave to him those rights of a patriarchate that the Council of Chalcedon had taken from him and had given to the seat of the imperial city because of the flattery of certain people and the treachery of John whom [the Council of Chalcedon] had made [bishop] instead of Bassianus, who had resigned, departed, and [then] went into exile.⁴ Timothy was received [in Alexandria] with a ceremony, and without a grudge he received those who repented among the party of Proterius and of Timothy Wobblecap, the latter having been driven out prior to [Timothy's arrival] by order of the emperor.

c. Then it narrates what Acacius did in Constantinople through sedition and the rebellion that he made against Basiliscus: he seized the churches and

1 Syr. *'pypnstss*, Gk. *epiphanestatos*. Marcus was the son of Basiliscus and Zenonis, made Caesar in 475 and subsequently promoted to the rank of Augustus. See *PLRE* ii, Marcus 4. The rank of *illustris* was the highest among the various gradations, see Jones 1964, 529.

2 See below on v.1a on these individuals and for commentary on the events summarised here.

3 Spelled here 'Zenaia'. See n.54 below.

4 This is not described below but is rather related at PZ iv.5a.

forced [Basiliscus] to issue the *Antienyclicicon* and to renounce his earlier letter, and these bishops [who had signed the *Encyclicicon*] signed the *Antienyclicicon*, except for Amphilochius of Side⁵ and Epiphanius of Magdalon. Then Zeno returned and became Autocrator, and he drove out Basiliscus and annulled by the laws that he made everything that [Basiliscus] had commanded. Although he wanted to banish Timothy, [Timothy] had passed away⁶ [while still] in his see. In his place Peter became [bishop], who went into hiding because of the threats of Zeno. Then Timothy [208] Wobblecap returned, and seized the church, and conducted a search for Peter.

d. It also gives information concerning a certain abbot John who was sent to Zeno with a petition from the party of Timothy Wobblecap in order that [Zeno] should decree that after the death of Timothy [Wobblecap] one of his own party should become bishop in Alexandria; and this John coveted the see [for himself]. Zeno found out, and while investigating him, he required from him an oath before the senators and also bishop Acacius that he would not become bishop. Just as he returned to Alexandria, having in his possession the order of the emperor that whomever of [Timothy Wobblecap's] party the city wished would become bishop after Timothy, at the same time it happened that Timothy Wobblecap died. Then John broke his oaths and gave a bribe so that he would become bishop there. When Zeno heard through some prominent believers among the monks who were sent up to [Zeno] and reported on all that had happened in Alexandria from the time of the Council, he was moved to change his mind and create the document [known as] the *Henoticon*. He ordered that Peter return to his place, [on condition that he] accept the *Henoticon*, and that John the liar be dismissed.

e. John then departed for Rome and made it known that on account of the Council and the Tome he had been dismissed from his place. Zeno then wrote to the patriarch there [in Rome] and exposed John. Then Peter of Antioch returned, held a synod, and accepted the *Henoticon*, [as did] Acacius of Constantinople and Martyrius of Jerusalem, who became [bishop] after Anastasius. They wrote synodal letters and were united to Peter of Alexandria, [all] except [209] the see of Rome. Then some zealous monks separated from Peter and became schismatics⁷ because he had accepted the *Henoticon* in which there was no explicit condemnation of the Council. Peter drove them out from their monasteries, and some of them went up to Zeno and

⁵ Amphilochius is not mentioned at v.5b and probably represents PZ's own addition, inferring his stance on the basis of his fierce opposition to Chalcedon related at iv.7; so AK 322.

⁶ Lit. 'was at rest'.

⁷ Gk. *apokhistai*: see further n.66 below.

urged him to send back with them Cosmas the *spatharius*, and he investigated their case. On another occasion [Zeno sent] the prefect Arsenius, and there arose many disputes.⁸

f. These [events] are written explicitly in the twelve chapters of this fifth book, each of which, as one might say, being from the chronicle of Zachariah, has been translated from the Greek and written down here in the Syriac language for the instruction and the knowledge of the diligent, in order that they may understand what has happened in previous times.

a. The first chapter of the fifth book narrates how Timothy returned from exile after the death of [Emperor] Leo and urged on Basiliscus with regard to the *Encyclicon*.

After Timothy had finished [his] eighteen years of exile,⁹ and Leo Autocrator had died, and Zeno was ruling after him, at this time in his reign when the Alexandrians became aware [of what was happening] they sent a petition through some outstanding monks who, we might say, were prominent and illustrious. Among them were Amun who was called the ‘Wild Bull’; Paul, who had been a lawyer; Theorion and James, who were miracle workers; and Theopompus, the brother of the *magister [officiorum]*.¹⁰ However, in the rebellion that occurred against Zeno by Basiliscus, [who was] the brother of Verina, the wife of [Emperor] Leo, who had been a *magister militum*¹¹ with [210] Zeno in the time of [Emperor] Leo,¹² Zeno

8 The summary anticipates in these last two sentences events that are related in book vi.

9 Timothy Aelurus had been exiled in late 459 or early 460: see PZ iv n.88. The figure of eighteen is thus slightly inflated, since Zeno succeeded to the throne in 474: see n.14 below.

10 Amun, a monk, is attested in Constantinople in the early 480s, returning to Egypt in 482 for the official accession of Peter Mongus, Lib. *Brev.* 17/119; see also n.78 below. Blaudeau 2006a, 338 n.387, suggests that his nickname may testify to the ferocity with which he opposed the pagans of Alexandria. Paul is Paulus 22 in *PLRE* ii: having been a sophist, he became a monk. He is mentioned also by Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 14 (p.30), cf. 57 (pp.113–14) and PZ vi.1a below, cf. Blaudeau 2003, 158. Theorion and James are not otherwise known; clearly they were famous for miraculous cures, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 339. Nothing is known of Theopompus save his relationship to Theoctistus, the *magister officiorum* (on which see below). They arrived in Constantinople most likely in the second half of January 476, so Redies 1997, 213 n.23. Blaudeau 2006a, 173, suggests rather that Aelurus’ supporters, alerted by Theoctistus of the change of regime, sent the delegation to Basiliscus in response.

11 Gk, *stratēgos*, ‘general’, often used for the post of *magister militum*: see next note.

12 Probably in the early 470s: Basiliscus had been *magister militum praesentalis* until the disastrous expedition against the Vandals of 468. Having been pardoned for this debacle he may yet have retained this rank; Zeno was *magister militum per Orientem* from 469 to 471, then *magister militum praesentalis* in 473–4. See *PLRE* ii, Basiliscus 2 and Zeno 7.

withdrew to the strongholds called Salmon,¹³ and Basiliscus assumed the crown¹⁴ and made his physician Theoctistus, an Alexandrian and the brother of the monk Theopompus, *magister officiorum*.¹⁵ When these monks entered his presence, the emperor, the important men, and the empress were amazed at them. Even the *magister officiorum* Theoctistus and Acacius the bishop [of Constantinople] assisted them and Basiliscus ordered that Timothy return. At first, Acacius prepared for him lodging in the church called Irene and set aside some of his clergy for the man's retinue¹⁶ and service. Later, Acacius became upset and bore a grudge because he thought that they were preparing to make Theopompus [bishop] instead of him in the imperial city.¹⁷ Although he tried, he was unable to stop the arrival of Timothy, and he returned and was received with great ceremony by the Alexandrian sailors and by the people who were present in Constantinople. He stayed in the imperial palace and many people approached him to be blessed, to be sanctified, and to receive healing from him.¹⁸

13 Location uncertain. Mich. Syr. ix.5 (251a/143) refers to Solomon, while Chabot n.6 *ad loc.* notes that the Armenian version of Michael has Salamê. No other source refers to the place(s). Hild and Hellenkemper 1990 do not list it. Hugh Elton suggests to us that, since the reference is to a plurality of fortresses, this could be PZ's garbled rendering of the province of Isauria (which is otherwise mentioned by the historian only at vii.2a). At *V. Sev.* 26 Zach. refers to Sulmon (the same spelling as Salmon, save for the addition of an aleph as the second letter), the place of origin of Demetrius, one of his fellow students at Alexandria.

14 PZ passes over the details of Basiliscus' seizure of power. At the end of November 474 Leo's young son Leo II died, leaving Zeno as sole emperor. A coalition rapidly gathered against him, involving Leo's widow Verina, her brother Basiliscus, her nephew Armatius and the Isaurian Illus. Zeno therefore fled Constantinople on the night of 9 January 475. See Stein 1959, 363, Lippold 1972, 159–61, Redies 1997, 213–15, Blaudeau 2003, 156–7.

15 *PLRE* ii, Theoctistus 3, also mentioned in the *V. Dan. Styl.* 83 as a target of the wrath of the people of Constantinople. Cantarelli 1909, 406, identifies this Theoctistus with the prefect of Egypt at PZ v.5c (in 477–8), Theoctistus 4 in *PLRE* ii, but this seems unlikely.

16 Lit. 'procession.'

17 This plot is not mentioned in any other source. Zach. is generally hostile to Acacius, and so the imputation of a personal motive is suspicious. See Grillmeier ii.1, 275/243, Redies 1997, 215, Blaudeau 2006a, 174–5. It is possible, as Blaudeau 2006a, 282 n.163, suggests, that this is a garbled reference to Timothy's intention to hold a new council, and that the reference to Acacius belongs rather at v.5a below, cf. n.76.

18 Timothy had to pass through Constantinople on his way back from Cherson (on the Black Sea) to Alexandria; he probably reached the city in March 476, see Redies 1997, 213 n.23. On his favourable reception, perhaps exaggerated by Zach., see Schwartz 1934, 185–6, Frend 1972, 170, Grillmeier ii.1, 268/237, Redies 1997, 215, Blaudeau 2006a, 350. Th. Lect. 404 (= Theoph. 121.8–11) describes how Timothy processed from Basiliscus' house to a church in Constantinople, attended by a crowd of Alexandrian sailors, but had to turn back after falling off the ass on which he was riding. See also *Coll. Avell.*, ep.56 (pp.125–6), noting how Timothy

b. When Timothy and those who were present there with him and on his behalf became on familiar terms with Basiliscus and his wife,¹⁹ he urged on the emperor and he agreed to write the *Encyclicon*, in which he condemned the Tome and the addition that took place at [the Council of] Chalcedon, because Paul the monk drafted it, an orator and a sophist who while debating with Patriarch Acacius was able to demonstrate in the debate that the heresies of Nestorius and of Eutyches are one [and the same], even though they are thought to be the opposite of each other. The [first heresy] states the objection that it is an offence to God [211] that he should be born of a woman, and should resemble us in all things, having been transformed into flesh and blood; but rather only by the equivalence of name, by the power, by the indwelling, and by operation [did he participate in human nature]. The other [heresy], [although trying to] liberate and exalt God so that he should not be dishonoured and despised in a human body, spread [the idea] that from his [own] being he became material, and took a heavenly body, and that just as nothing remains in the wax from the seal or in the clay from the seal of a gold ring, there did not cleave to Christ anything from the human [qualities].²⁰ When he had said these things, Acacius was amazed at the soundness of the man's discourse, and he assented and agreed [with it]. He went over to Timothy and spoke with him amicably, like one respecting the rights of [his] see, but when he was requested by Timothy to sign the *Encyclicon*, he hesitated.²¹

was acclaimed by his followers in the capital but denied communion, cf. *ep.57* (p.130). Blaudeau 2006a, 321 and n.325, cf. 351, plausibly sees in Th. Lect.'s account an attempt to counteract pro-Timothy propaganda that likened his reception to that of Christ (entering Jerusalem).

19 Basiliscus' wife was Zenonis, on whom see *PLRE* ii, Zenonis. She was, according to Th. Lec. 402, an ardent Miaphysite or rather Eutychian: see Schwartz 1934, 185, Frend 1972, 169 and v.4b below.

20 These descriptions of Nestorianism and Eutychianism are broadly accurate, although that of Nestorianism is somewhat distorted: it is correct about the objection to God being born of Mary, but Nestorius preferred to see Christ as composed of two distinct natures, human and divine, united by will: see *ODCC*, 1138–9, Wickham 1983, xxxiii. Although the two heresies are very different, they were often associated as doctrines to be condemned, e.g. at v.4a below. See n.52 below on the analogy offered for Eutychianism. Zach. continues to emphasise the inconsistency of Acacius. As Frend 1972, 171, notes, the *Encyclicon* of Basiliscus condemned both heresies (in the section where PZ's text breaks off). Blaudeau 2006a, 587, points out that this double condemnation is a leitmotif in Zach.'s work.

21 Acacius' hesitation is understandable. On the one hand, the initial version of the *Encyclicon* did not threaten directly the privileges of Constantinople and his attachment to Chalcedon was luke-warm at best (see PZ iv.11a), but on the other he was no doubt aware of potential difficulties in the capital itself and threats to his position (see n.17 above). See Redies 1997, 216, Blaudeau 2006a, 175, and further n.77 below.

a. The second chapter narrates the *Encyclicon* of Basiliscus and Marcus, which was as [follows].²²

‘Basiliscus Autocrator, the emperor, the believing, victorious, and eternally-virtuous ruler, Augustus, and Marcus, the most illustrious Caesar²³ to Timothy the reverend and God-loving head of the bishops of the great city of Alexandria. We wish that all the laws that the believing emperors worthy of memory have rightly and justly set down prior to us for the salvation and correction of the whole world, for the sake of the true faith of our guides, the apostles and our holy fathers, should stand and not be annulled hastily. Accordingly, we consider them as our own, and agree to them.’²⁴

22 More complete versions of the *Encyclicon*, also referred to as the Encyclical, i.e. a circular letter (CPG 5997) may be found in Schwartz 1927b, 49–51, Evagr. iii.4, Nic. Call. xvi.3. *RSCC*, 915–17, offers an English translation of Evagrius’ version, cf. Whitby 2000a, 134–7. For a discussion of the differences between the first two Greek versions see Schwartz 1927b, 133–5, Schwartz 1934, 186 n.4, Festugière 1975, 482–4, Allen 1981, 124, Grillmeier ii.1, 268 n.3/237 n.3, Whitby 2000a, 133 n.9; Evagrius’ version, unlike that in Schwartz and that of Zach., omits certain references to the councils of Nicaea and Ephesus II (449) and might therefore represent a subsequent alteration of the document to make it more palatable to Acacius, the patriarch of Constantinople, whose authority was diminished by the original version. But the consensus now is that Evagrius’ version represents the original, which was then expanded and made more anti-Chalcedonian subsequently at the synod in Ephesus (on which see below). See Schwartz 1934, 186 n.4, Brennecke 1998, 35. Draguet 1928, 55–9, suggests that Basiliscus approved the Evagrian version, while Paul the sophist actually produced a more extreme variant, and it was this that was preserved in Egypt, finding its way into the *Vaticanus graecus* (i.e. Schwartz 1927b). Blaudeau 2006a, 177–9, challenges the consensus, arguing that the more hard-line document is the original version, which led the Eutychians to believe that Aelurus supported them (see v.4 below); Evagrius’ document therefore was established to clarify matters, eliminating (e.g.) the reference to Ephesus II and the impingements on Constantinople’s prerogatives. Thus, he suggests, Acacius came to support the document, and Evagrius may have had access to this version from the archives of the patriarchate in Constantinople, *ibid.*, 179–80, 456, and see n.54 below. Note that Evagr.’s and Zach.’s versions are addressed to the bishop of Alexandria, while that in Schwartz is addressed to ‘the metropolitans and peoples of the whole Oikoumene’ (Schwartz 1927b, no.49, 73.2–3). *RSCC*, 918 n.4, points out that Zach.’s version is considerably looser than the Greek ones; in its readings, however, it appears to draw from the text in Schwartz (so Schwartz 1934, 186 n.4). As Dovère 1985, esp. 168–80 (cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 273/241, Blaudeau 2006a, 173–4), emphasises, the *Encyclicon* represents a significant step in the trend towards direct imperial intervention in doctrinal matters: the document itself is cast in the form of an imperial edict. According to Seeck 1919, 421, the *Encyclicon* was issued at Easter 475, i.e. 6 April, even if Frend 1972, 170 dates it to 9 April.

23 PZT, i, 211 indicates with ellipses a lacuna in the manuscript. The Syriac reads literally (with minor corrections), ‘Autocrator Basiliscus, the believing and victorious emperor, ruler ... eternally Augustus.’ On Marcus’ title see n.1 above.

24 Dovère 1985, 171–2, notes how Basiliscus seeks to buttress his *Encyclicon* by invoking

b. We strive to honour more than any human matter the fear of God, with zeal for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, our God, [212] who made us, exalted us, and glorified us. It being true for us that the unity of his flock is our salvation and that of our people, a true and immovable foundation, and the high wall of our reign, We, as though prudently inspired, are offering to the church of Christ in every place of our dominion the union and unity which is [based upon] the truth and that precept of human life, namely the faith of the 318 bishops, who were foreordained by the Holy Spirit and were assembled at Nicaea,²⁵ [the faith] which we and all who were before us have held and in which We believe and were baptised, in order that [the truth] should preserve and guide all the churches with their tested canons, that [truth] which is complete and perfect in the entire fear of God and the true faith, and that uncovers and rejects all heresies, and drives them out from the church; that [truth] which the 150 bishops²⁶ who gathered here confirmed, to which they adhered, and to which they agreed in opposition to those contending against the Holy Spirit, the Lord; [we] also [accept] the things that were done at Ephesus by the two assemblies²⁷ that were with the chief bishops Celestine, Cyril, and Dioscorus [the bishops of] Rome and Alexandria against Nestorius the heretic, and against those who followed after him, being of the same opinion, who confused the order of the church, disturbed the tranquillity of the world, and rent [its] unity.²⁸ We speak [here] concerning the Tome of Leo and concerning the [events that took place] at Chalcedon, whether the things in [its] definition of faith, or in [its] doctrine, or [in] its explanation, or [in] its additions [to the faith], or in anything else that was said or done as an innovation contrary to the faith and the definition of the 318 [bishops at Nicaea].²⁹

orthodox decrees of earlier emperors. See also Blaudeau 2006a, 279–80, on Alexandrian attitudes towards such imperial intervention.

25 The first ecumenical council (held in 325).

26 A reference to the second ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 381. As Grillmeier ii.1, 273/241–2 (cf. 270 n.6/238 n.6) notes, the Alexandrian church generally had little enthusiasm for this council, which had accorded greater authority to the see of Constantinople, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 251–2.

27 The third ecumenical council, held in Ephesus in 431, and the so-called ‘Robber council’ held there in 449, cf. *RSCC*, 919 n.14. On the rehabilitation of Ephesus II, noted also by Vict. Ton. §45, a.475 (= Th. Lect. frg.16), see Blaudeau 2006a, 178 and n.429, cf. 568.

28 Zach.’s text is fuller here, following Schwartz 1927b, 50.13–15, whereas Evagr. leaves out the references to these bishops. As Frend 1972, 171, notes, the reference to pope Celestine shows that the Encyclical was not seeking to challenge the position of Rome.

29 See Whitby 2000a, 134 n.10, on this tendency to try to go back to the Nicene definition, visible already in the aftermath of Chalcedon.

c. Therefore We command that, be it here or in any other place, wherever is found the teaching in the writings of these [people], being condemned it should be burned in fire, because [our orders] are like [213] the orders that the previous blessed emperors Constantine the Great and Theodosius³⁰ had commanded and set down. They confirmed only the faith that was [expressed] in Nicaea, and agreed to the true definition that was made only by these three [councils] that came after it, [namely], that of the 150 bishops here, and of the two [councils] in Ephesus.

d. We condemn all who do not agree that the Only-Begotten Son of God became embodied truly through the Holy Spirit from Mary the virgin, and became human and took a body at the incarnation neither from heaven in semblance nor in fantasy; and every deceitful teaching of every heresy that is against the true faith of our fathers...’ and the rest that is in the *Encyclicon*.³¹

e. Timothy agreed to this letter and signed [it], as well as Peter of Antioch³² and Paul of Ephesus³³ who were recalled from exile,³⁴ and the bishops of Asia and of the East, and Anastasius of Jerusalem and [the bishops] under

30 As is clear from Evagr. and Schwartz 1927b, 50.27, the reference is to Theodosius II. See Dovre 1985, 171–2, on this attempt to justify legislation by appealing to measures of earlier emperors. For examples of such measures see *RSCC*, 920 n.19: many can be found in *C.Th.* xvi.5. The reference might be to *C.Th.* xvi.5.66 in particular (against the Nestorians), so Blaudeau 2006a, 177 n.420. See also Whitby 2000a, 135 n.11.

31 This is a drastic compression of the document: Zach. reproduces only about a half of it. The remaining section calls upon bishops to sign the document, forbids any further discussion of the issue and outlines penalties for any who seek to challenge it. Allen 1981, 124 n.16, suggests that PZ may have cut off the text here.

32 Peter the Fuller, the deposed patriarch of Antioch, who at this time was being guarded in the monastery of the Akoimetai just outside Constantinople (Th. Lect. 403 = Theoph. 121.23–6). After his (first) deposition he was exiled to Oasis in Egypt, then escaped and was allowed to remain with the Akoimetai in Constantinople on the condition that he keep a low profile, *Coll. Avell.*, ep. 99.25 (pp.450–1). According to Joh. Nik. 88.43 he had backed Basiliscus from the start and even crowned him. Peter had already been patriarch between 469 and 471 and returned to office again under Basiliscus. He was the proponent of the addition ‘who was crucified for us’ to the Trisagion in the liturgy, which became a popular anti-Chalcedonian slogan. Despite his prominence, neither Zach. nor Evagr. devote much attention to him, the latter perhaps in order to pass over a troubled period in the Antiochene patriarchate, the former because of a general lack of interest in the see. It is possible, however, that Evagr., who for this section more or less translates Zach., made no attempt to flesh out the information available in his source, despite the resources at Antioch at his disposal. See Allen 1981, 123, van Esbroeck 1996, 465–6, Whitby 2000a, 137 n.15.

33 Evagr. iii.6 reports that Paul had been ordained bishop by the bishops of Asia (rather than the patriarch of Constantinople), but had subsequently been expelled from his see.

34 Paul’s place of exile is uncertain; see further n.56 below.

his authority,³⁵ so that the number of bishops who signed the *Encyclicon* was 700,³⁶ more or less, and they condemned the Tome of Leo and the Council and sent a petition to Basiliscus and to Marcus which was as follows.

a. The third chapter, which communicates the petition of the bishops from Asia who assembled at Ephesus,³⁷ signed the *Encyclicon*, and wrote to Basiliscus and Marcus as follows.

‘[To] the believing, Christ-loving, and victorious emperors Basiliscus and Marcus, the Augusti,³⁸ Paul,³⁹ Pergamius,⁴⁰ Gennadius,⁴¹ Zenodotus,⁴² Zoticus,⁴³ Gennadius, Theophilus,⁴⁴ and the rest of the bishops that have

35 Patriarch of Jerusalem, 458–78. His willingness to sign up to the document is unsurprising, given the strife that had afflicted Palestine during Marcian’s reign (see PZ iii.3–9 with Perrone 1980, 122, Maraval 1998b, 116–17). In general, however, the region was gradually shifting towards a more favourable stance to Chalcedon: see Perrone 1980, 125–39, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 306–7.

36 Evagr. iii.5 (104.29) puts the total at 500, which could be the result of a copyist’s error at some stage. According to Mich. Syr. ix.5 (251b/146), 600 bishops attended the synod at Ephesus, cf. Lebon 1909, 27 and n.6, Frend 1972, 171. BL Add. 12,155 (an eighth-century manuscript gathering together ‘demonstrations’ against heresies, on which see Wright 1871, 921 with 936 on the context of this section), fols.108^r-109^v, ed. and tr. Nau in *PO* 13 (1919), 166, offers the same list of adherents (though with no reference to those recalled from exile) and the same figure of 700 bishops.

37 The synod that took place in Ephesus while Timothy was en route from Constantinople to Alexandria is described by Zach. at v.4. Although some have dated it to 476, Redies 1997, 216–17, demonstrates that it must have taken place already by October 475 at the latest. On the order of events here, slightly distorted by the insertion of this document, see Whitby 2000a, 138 n.17 with Redies 1997, 220–1. The letter to the emperors is *CPG* 9106 (where it is wrongly referred to as an Antiochene synod, cf. Brennecke 1998, 35 n.64). Mich. Syr. ix.5 (251b/146) quotes from a more outspoken version of the document, pronouncing anathema on Acacius and rejecting Chalcedon and the tome, cf. n.48 below. Blaudeau 2006a, 181, argues that the assembled bishops, now aware of Acacius’ antipathy towards even the more moderate version of the Encyclical, deliberately therefore hardened their stance.

38 This introduction is quoted by Evagr iii.5 (105.1–3).

39 Bishop of Ephesus, reinstated by Timothy Aelurus, see n.56 below.

40 AK 324 suggest identifications of these bishops with homonyms from the vicinity of Ephesus who were present at Chalcedon. Given that more than twenty years had passed since then, the identifications are clearly tenuous. In this case they identify this Pergamius with the bishop of Antioch in Pisidia, cf. *HEO*, 255.

41 Of the three identifications proposed by AK 324, one, with the bishop of Acmonia in Phrygia I, can be ruled out, since a successor is attested already in 458/9, cf. *HEO*, 152. The other two, with the bishop of Mosyna in the same province or Teos in Asia, remain possible (for both the Gennadii here referred to), cf. *HEO*, 136, 160.

42 Possibly bishop of Telmessus in Lycia, cf. *HEO*, 237.

43 Possibly bishop of Anaia in Asia or of Harpasa in Caria, cf. *HEO*, 119, 197.

44 Possibly bishop of Ariassus in Pamphylia, cf. *HEO*, 247.

assembled at Ephesus. Through all things you have shown yourselves to be believing and Christ-loving emperors: when the true faith was persecuted,⁴⁵ you were persecuted with it through the cunning of some men [who are] [214] rebels and conceited persons, whose mind is corrupted, who are despicable and empty of the faith of the Son of God who became humble for our sake and became human and made us worthy of adoption. Therefore, exult and rejoice, be glad and give praise, because you have been counted worthy to be persecuted along with the faith.⁴⁶ For the [others] is reserved the judgment of eternal fire that consumes persecutors, and [also] your upright threat is upon them, because they have despised us, slandered us, acted falsely with us, and subjugated us with fear so that we might agree to their teaching.

b. Now that the light of the faith has dawned upon us, and the gloom of error has been rolled away from us, we make known to Your Majesty and to all the world our true faith, with this declaration that we are signing in freedom, with the consent of our will, and with the help of our guide John the Evangelist⁴⁷ – this *Encyclicon* – and agree to everything that is in it without coercion, fear, or respect of persons.⁴⁸ If at any time violence from anyone should happen to us, we are prepared to scorn fire or the sword or exile, or the seizure of what we possess, to despise all the sufferings of the body, and to cleave to the true faith because we have condemned and do condemn the things in the [acts of] Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, which were the cause of the shedding of the blood of many, of confusion, of disruption, of commotion, of schisms, and of conflicts for the whole world. For sufficient for us is the teaching of the faith of the apostles and of our holy fathers, the 318 bishops, and the honourable assembly of the 150 who adhered to it and confirmed it in the imperial city, as well as the two other holy councils in Ephesus.⁴⁹ With them we condemn Nestorius and all

45 There is no evidence for the persecution of either Basiliscus or Marcus because of their Miaphysite leanings; the former was disgraced because of the failure of the expedition against the Vandals in 468. Evagr. iii.5 (105.3–5) quotes this sentence from Zach., where the suffering of the two emperors is less associated with their Miaphysite stance.

46 Cf. Matthew 5.12.

47 John the Evangelist, identified with the apostle John and the author of Revelation, was traditionally thought to have spent part of his life at Ephesus, cf. *ODCC*, 880 and Blaudeau 2006a, 296 with nn.219–20.

48 Allen 1981, 125, argues that Evagr. iii.5, 105.23–8, is a shortened version of this section, although it clearly contains elements, such as an apparently oblique attack on Acacius, absent from PZ. It is more plausible that Evagr. is quoting a different section of this petition, cf. Whitby 2000a, 138 n.19.

49 References to the councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381), and Ephesus I (431) and II (449).

who do not confess that the Only-Begotten Son of God became embodied by [215] the Holy Spirit and from Mary the Virgin, and became a perfect human being while he remained without change perfect God, as he is, and [we affirm] that he did not become embodied from heaven in semblance or in fantasy, and [we condemn] all other heresies.’ They wrote other things, and cried out in acclamation and gave praise.⁵⁰ The rest of the bishops from [various] dioceses wrote a different declaration, the beginning of which is as follows: ‘With the consent of our thought concerning the 318 bishops, our fathers, we hold Your Majesty to be the [three hundred and] nineteenth, [for] you strive so that the true faith might prosper and be preached among every nation under your authority.’⁵¹

a. The fourth chapter of this same fifth book narrates the things that [took place] in Constantinople and in Ephesus after the *Encyclicon* [was promulgated].

When the emperor’s encyclical letter became known to everyone, some monks who were present in the imperial city and who thought like Eutyches gathered around Timothy, thinking that he would agree with them. They debated with him over what was written in the *Encyclicon*, which condemned anyone who said that Christ became embodied [only] in semblance. When he said to them, ‘What is your opinion concerning the embodiment?’ they brought to him the argument of the ring-seal, from whose seal nothing that belongs to it remains in the wax or in the clay. When he understood their intention, he admonished them and instructed them, ‘Scripture teaches us that Christ was like us in every detail, and became one of our nature perfectly except for the impulses of sin. [216] He was born supernaturally without copulation, though he was a perfect human being. He was conceived through the Virgin Mary and was born from her through the Holy Spirit, but remained without change; God who became flesh remained as he had been.’⁵²

50 Evagr. iii.5 offers further quotations from the petition, derived from the original text of Zach. They insist upon the free choice made by the bishops at Ephesus and demand the deposition of Acacius, who is, however, not named. On the heresies alluded to, which accepted a ‘fantastic’ incarnation of Christ, see n.52 and n.132 below.

51 Evagr. makes no reference to this other document.

52 Timothy thus refused to accept the strictly Monophysite views of these monks, who believed that Christ had only one nature, which was divine. As Frend 1972, 171 n.3, notes, the Eutychians had come to believe that Christ’s divinity had wholly subsumed his humanity. For more on Timothy’s christology see Lebon 1908, 686, PZ iv.6b and n.66. The argument here put forward by the Eutychians claims that Christ’s human form was just an external trapping of

b. When Timothy had learned from the entire discussion what those who were visiting him believed, he declared in letters that he wrote that Christ resembled us in all things belonging to humanity. Then the monks of that place separated from him, saying, ‘We have no association with the Alexandrians,’ but others, who came to know that he did not maintain the thought of Eutyches, attached themselves to him.⁵³ Those who were Eutychians were joined by their allies, and they advised Zenona, who was one of their faith, the wife of emperor Basiliscus, that Timothy should be dismissed again.⁵⁴ When Theoctistus the *magister officiorum* learned what was about to be done to him, he urged him to leave the city and to immediately get to Alexandria, so [Timothy] left. When he arrived at Ephesus he convened a synod⁵⁵ and restored Paul who had been bishop there, but who was ejected at that time because he did not accept the [decisions] of Chalcedon.⁵⁶ He returned to him the canonical rights of his see, which the assembly

the Word of God: the divine element left no trace in the mortal, just like the signet ring leaves nothing but an indentation in the wax. The Eutychians were thus also labelled ‘phantasiasts’; Julian of Halicarnassus made similar arguments in the sixth century (see PZ ix.9–13 below). See Lebon 1909, 496, Blaudeau 2006a, 260–1, cf. Leont. *Test.* 1816A–B for similar analogies.

53 An indication of the confusion that prevailed at the time, no doubt increased by the circulation of rumours that ascribed Eutychian views to Timothy (noted at iv.12a). Moderate miaphysites such as Timothy found themselves outflanked by more extreme miaphysites – Monophysites, in effect – while continuing their struggle against Chalcedon. See Grillmeier ii.4, 16–23/16–24; also Whitby 2000a, 139 n.23, who notes that Evagr. iii.5 (105.29–106.7) offers a brief summary of this episode, cf. Allen 1980, 478, pointing out that Evagr.’s quotations from Zach. have no equivalent in PZ’s work as it now stands.

54 Zenona is in error for Zenonis, cf. n.3 above. On the changing circumstances in Constantinople which led to Timothy’s departure, probably in late April 475, see Frend 1972, 171, Redies 1997, 216; Blaudeau 2006a, 180, would push the date on to September. Blaudeau 1996, 114–15, argues that it was the Eutychians and Zenonis who were responsible for his departure, rather than the Chalcedonians. *Coll. Avell., epp.*57–9 (pp.129–35), three letters of Simplicius to Acacius and the monks of Constantinople, testify to the efforts made by the pope to isolate Timothy. Despite the impression given in some modern works, e.g. Schwartz 1934, 187, Brennecke 1998, 36–7, Whitby 2000a, 138 n.19, Acacius appears to have remained remarkably passive at this stage, as Redies 1997, 216–17, establishes, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 175; it is noteworthy that Zach. does not mention his opposition as one of the factors leading to Timothy’s departure. Blaudeau 2006a, 179–80, suggests that he was even prepared to accept the *Encyclicon*, once shorn of its attacks on Constantinople’s privileges.

55 See n.37 above on the synod, which took place before October 475; also Schwartz 1934, 186, Frend 1972, 171, Whitby 2000a, 138 n.17.

56 As Schwartz 1934, 186 n.3, points out, this statement is problematic: at iv.5a Zach. reports the departure of Bassianus from Ephesus because of his refusal to subscribe to the Council of Chalcedon; he was replaced by a certain John. See PZ iv n.50 above. Sev. *ep.*i.60 in *Lett.*, 201/181, reports that Timothy accepted communion with Paul once he had condemned

of Chalcedon had stripped from him, and had given in partiality to the throne of the imperial city.⁵⁷

c. When he arrived in Alexandria he was received with great ceremony, with torches, and with [songs of] praise by the various nations and in the various languages that were present, even by the party of Proterius, who saw the love of the city for the man. The parade of priests, monks, sisters in Christ and at the end, the entire people, while singing psalms, saying, [217] ‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord,’⁵⁸ led him into the Great Church,⁵⁹ because Timothy Wobblecap, by order of the emperor had departed ahead of him.⁶⁰ Since he was a calm and pleasant man, and also humble in his words and not bearing a grudge, he permitted the members of the party of Proterius time for penance, according to [the letter] he had written and sealed while in exile concerning those who repent.⁶¹ Even Prolatius,⁶² who had dragged him off from the font of the baptistery, [Timothy] received just as cheerfully and peaceably as the [others], weeping and comforting [Prolatius] over those things that [he] had done to him in rebellion and insolence,

Chalcedon, which rather implies that his attitude to the council earlier had been more favourable, cf. Honigsmann 1951, 119, Blaudeau 2006a, 180 n.437. Evagr. iii.6, cf. Whitby 2000a, 140 n.24, reports that Paul had been elected by ‘traditional means’, i.e. by the local bishops, rather than the patriarch of Constantinople; see also Blaudeau 2006a, 296.

57 An allusion to the 28th canon of Chalcedon (*Acts Chalcd.* XVI.8 [ACO ii.1.3, pp.88–9]) by which the patriarch of Constantinople had been granted authority over the diocese of Asia, on which see (e.g.) Martin 1953, Frend 1972, 7–8, 171, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 67–73, Blaudeau 2006a, 297 and PZ iv. n.50 above.

58 Psalm 117(118).26, Matthew 21.9 and elsewhere; cf. *Vit. Tim. Ael.* 166/7 for a similarly eulogistic account of his return (but all the remainder of this work seems to refer to his deposition in 459/60). As AK 324 note, the same scriptural allusion is made by Simplicius in referring to Timothy’s arrival in Constantinople, *Coll. Avell.*, ep.56 (p.125). See Frend 1972, 173. See Blaudeau 2006a, 182, on Timothy Aelurus’ *adventus* (arrival). The emphasis on the diversity of those participating is designed to highlight the unity of the church behind the returning patriarch.

59 The Caesarian, on which see PZ iv n.18.

60 Th. Lect. 409 = Theoph. 121.14–17 also describes Timothy’s return to Alexandria, noting Timothy Wobblecap’s powerlessness and consequent withdrawal to his monastery at Canopus. On this bastion of Chalcedonianism in Egypt see Haas 1993, 304, Haas 1997, 321.

61 See PZ iv.12hh–jj on this letter, which has survived and is quoted by Zach.

62 The name is unclear: it could also be Problanus or (less likely) Prolatis. Brooks, PZV i, 150 n.4, suggests the Greek *periodeutês* (visiting priest) or the Latin *parabalanus* (a bath attendant, employed by the church, some of whom were notorious for strong-arm tactics, see Wickham 1983, xvii n.17, Haas 1997, 235–7) or (if it is a proper name) Probatius. We have kept to Brooks’ reading of Prolatius, but the most tempting alternative would be ‘bath attendant’. AK 66 and n.1 suggest ‘child-killers’ based on a Greek form *paidoletores*, which seems implausible, cf. Kugener 1900b, 463.

for such is the rule for the leaders of the church, as Timothy showed through his actions towards many: the love for those who are near that does not seek its own [reward] and does not become angry.⁶³

d. But some who do not know the duties of divine love separated from him because of his gentleness and humility towards those who repented, because he did not require of them anything except that they condemn the Council and the Tome, and confess the true faith, and because he did not separate them, not even for a little while, from the communion of which they had been deprived. Theodotus, the bishop of Joppa, whom Theodosius [of Jerusalem] had made [bishop] earlier, became their leader out of envy because he did not return to his see and was not accepted.⁶⁴ Now the famous Peter the Iberian did not return to Gaza: he was not of the same mind as they but was attached to [Timothy] through love, and he proved that his conduct and his actions agreed with the will of God.⁶⁵ Thus the schismatics⁶⁶ who were with Theodotus became contemptible,⁶⁷ and even went and [re-]chrismated [218] [the penitents], and [so] were called Anachristo-Novatians.⁶⁸

e. The great affection of the people for Timothy increased even more

63 Cf. 1 Corinthians 13.5.

64 The manuscript here has 'Theodoret', but a few lines later has 'Theodotus', which is the correct form. Cf. Evagr. iii.6, who, again citing Zach. explicitly, recounts the same details here (106.17–22). Theodotus, having been installed as bishop in the early 450s by Theodosius, the rival of Juvenal, would have been unable to regain his see after the return of Juvenal in 453. See Perrone 1980, 123–4, Whitby 2000a, 140 n.25, Blaudeau 2006a, 183.

65 *V. Petr. Iber.* 105/77 reports that Peter did travel to Palestine c.475, around the time of the *Encyclicon*. Upon his return, Timothy entered into correspondence with Peter, urging him to return to Egypt, but he demurred: see *V. Petr. Iber.* 109/78–9, cf. Perrone 1980, 123, Blaudeau 2001a, 356. See also AK 325, who suggest that a 'not' may have been wrongly inserted into PZ's text; however, as they note, the mention at vi.1c of Peter being still in Egypt implies rather that Zach. is here drawing on a different tradition entirely.

66 Gk. *aposkhistai*, the same term used by Cyr. Scyth., *V. Euthym.* 3, p.62.18–20 (for the separatists in Palestine), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 785.

67 Lebon 1909, 28 n.2, suggests that the criticism is directed at the (re-)confirmation of baptism.

68 Timothy Aelurus and after him Severus of Antioch took a moderate line with those who joined them who had hitherto subscribed to Chalcedon, just as had been done for Nestorians after the Council of Ephesus in 431. Some found this approach too conciliatory and insisted, as Zach. relates, on re-anointing them before accepting them, from which the 'anachristo' part of the label derives; the Novatians were a rigorist group in the third century who refused to readmit Christians who had lapsed during persecutions: see *ODCC*, 1165 and cf. *Sev. Sel. Lett.*, ep.i.60 (203/182). These hard-liners became a powerful force in Alexandria at this time and continued to cause problems in the early sixth century for Severus: see Perrone 1980, 123–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 274, 785 and PZ vi n.36.

because he brought the bones of Dioscorus and of his brother Anatolius with him in a silver coffin by order of the emperor. With ceremony he buried him and placed him in the place of the bishops, honouring him as a confessor.⁶⁹ So liberal was the man's love that he willingly set aside one *denarius* a day from the church to be given for the budget and use of Timothy, who had been deposed, who sustained himself with handiwork, weaving baskets and selling them.⁷⁰ He gave to the nobles and to the leading people of the city a blessing of three *paximatia*⁷¹ each, and to emperor Basiliscus and to the patricians of the city he sent only the same [amount].⁷² One time, the tax collector came to him with writings from the emperor, and he gave him the same. [The tax collector] turned to him and said, 'I need the blessing of some *denarii*.' [Timothy] said, 'It is right for the church to make payments [such as] these to the widows and the orphans.'

f. When the people learned that a prefect of [the city] by the name of Boetius⁷³ was a Eutychian, they cried out in the church, 'Papa! Say, "May Nestorius and Eutyches be condemned!"' and immediately he condemned them with his living word before the prefect. With this the man was cleared of the suspicion that he communed with the prefect and thus with Eutychians.⁷⁴

These things happened in Alexandria.

69 On Timothy's brother Anatolius see PZ iv n.189 with Nau's remarks in *PO* 13 (1919), 206 n.1, who notes that the *Hist. Patr. Alex.*, *PO* 1 (1904), 445, reports Anatolius' presence at Gangra with Timothy during his exile. Dioscorus had died in Gangra in September 454; Timothy no doubt recovered his remains during his own period of exile there. *Hist. Diosc.*, 307, reports that upon his death, Dioscorus' body was laid in a coffin, ready to be taken to Alexandria. See further Watts 2010, 225.

70 Cf. Th. Lect. 409 = Theoph. 121.17–21 on the Alexandrians saluting Timothy upon his return 'You have fed your enemies, pope!', which Blaudeau 2006a, 153 n.271, convincingly interprets as referring to his support for Timothy Wobblecap (against Scott's tr. in Mango and Scott 1996, 188).

71 Syr. *pkswmī*, 'paxoumatia,' from Gk. *paximatia*, 'little cakes,' probably not the original word.

72 The resources at the disposal of the patriarch of Alexandria were considerable, as (e.g.) the sums paid by Cyril to officials and members of the imperial family before the Council of Ephesus attest. See Haas 1997, 249–53, Watts 2010, 167. Zach. thus emphasises Timothy's piety in allocating as much as possible to the poor; Haas 1993, 301–2, cf. Haas 1997, 319, suggests that Timothy shrewdly used his powers of patronage to boost his position in Alexandria. Blaudeau 2006a, 615 n.217, supposes that Timothy's gifts consisted of embroidered cloth.

73 *PLRE* ii, Boethius 2, who may be identical with Boethius 4, the father of the philosopher Boethius. For a convincing argument in favour of the identification see Courcelle 1948, 299 n.1. See also Cantarelli 1909, 405 no.153.

74 The fact that Timothy needed to reiterate his condemnation of Eutyches and Nestorius testifies to the continuing uncertainty surrounding his christological position. Cf. n.53 above.

a. The fifth chapter of the same fifth book narrates what Acacius of Constantinople brought to pass, and concerning the *Antienyclicon*, and concerning Peter of Antioch and Paul of Ephesus who were deposed [219] again when emperor Zeno returned and Basiliscus was driven out.

When Acacius of Constantinople learned that the previous authority of the see of Paul of Ephesus had been restored by Timothy, that Peter had returned to Antioch,⁷⁵ and that they were preparing to convene against him a synod in Jerusalem to depose him and set up in his place Theopompus, the brother of the *magister officiorum*,⁷⁶ [Acacius] incited the monks and encouraged them, had Daniel brought down from the pillar, seized the churches, and rebelled against Basiliscus, saying that he was a heretic.⁷⁷ When Basiliscus heard, along with this, that Zeno had returned with a large army, he became desperate, fashioned the *Antienyclicon*, and annulled his first letter.⁷⁸ When Zeno had returned and Basiliscus had been driven out,

75 Peter the Fuller, on whom see n.32 above. On his return see Blaudeau 2006a, 310 n.282.

76 This intrigue is reported only by Zach., though cf. Joh. Nik. 88.33 (a reference to a planned council in Jerusalem), but is generally seen as plausible: see Schwartz 1934, 187, Grillmeier ii.1, 275/243, Frend 1972, 173, Perrone 1980, 125, Blaudeau 2006a, 322. Cf. n.17 above and Blaudeau 2006a, 294, arguing that the choice of Jerusalem was an attempt by Aelurus to assure Martyrius that his patriarchal throne was safe. On Theopompus see n.10 above.

77 Zach. (or PZ) is heavily compressing events here. At iv.11c (cf. n.119 *ad loc.*) he reported that Acacius, upon becoming patriarch in 472, vowed to overturn Chalcedon, yet here he emerges as the leading defender of the council. Redies 1997, 215–17, shows that it was only after prolonged deliberation, and under pressure from the people and clergy of the capital, that the patriarch came down firmly against the *Encyclicon*: see n.54 above. Acacius received the support of Pope Simplicius in letters from Rome (*Coll. Avell.*, *epp.* 57–9 [pp.129–35]) that arrived in Constantinople probably in the second half of February 476, at which point Basiliscus moved to arrest him. The attempt was foiled by the popular support he enjoyed, whereupon he enlisted the support of Daniel the Stylite. The saint descended from his pillar just outside the capital and processed through the city, working miracles and obliging Basiliscus (eventually, although *V. Dan. Styl.* 83 implies immediately) to rescind the *Encyclicon*. A more detailed account may be found in *V. Dan. Styl.* 70–85. See Redies 1997, 217–18, Blaudeau 2006a, 184–5, cf. Frend 1972, 172–3.

78 Evagr. iii.7 criticises Zach. for omitting the text of the *Antienyclicon* and provides a version of it himself; another may be found in Schwartz 1927b, 52 (no.74). See Allen 1981, 126, Whitby 2000a, 141 n.28, cf. *RSCC*, 917–18 for another translation. Although Daniel and Acacius' demarche probably took place in February/March 476, Redies 1997, 218–19, argues that it was not until the summer, as Zeno's army drew near, that Basiliscus finally conceded to the patriarch and issued the *Antienyclicon* (*CPG* 5998), just as Zach. here describes, cf. Schwartz 1934, 189, Grillmeier ii.1, 276 n.27/244 n.27, Blaudeau 2006a, 185–7. Mich. Syr. ix.5 (252b/147) recounts that Amun (see v.1a above) predicted Basiliscus' downfall if ever he rejected the *Encyclicon*, as now duly happened. The *Antienyclicon* did not uphold Chalcedon: it merely annulled the *Encyclicon* and explicitly restored the privileges of the patriarchate

bhe made a law that annulled all that Basiliscus had done.⁷⁹ He deposed Peter of Antioch and Paul of Ephesus and made many threats against Timothy.⁸⁰ However, [Timothy] had departed and journeyed to his Lord, was buried with great ceremony, and was laid in the grave by Peter who was [made bishop] after him by the bishops of the country according to the canons.⁸¹

of Constantinople. This was sufficient for it to be perceived by opponents of the council as a Chalcedonian document, however, which would explain its omission from Zach.'s work. See Allen 1981, 126–7, Grillmeier ii.1, 276/244, Blaudeau 1996, 116, Whitby 2000a, 141 n.28.

79 Zeno re-entered Constantinople in August 476; most of Basiliscus' former allies had by then defected to his side. For a narrative of the political events see Brooks 1893, 216–18, Stein 1959, 363–4, Lippold 1972, 162–3. The law that rescinded Basiliscus' ecclesiastical legislation is *C.J.* i.2.16 (of 17 December 476), translated in *RSCC*, 923, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 282/249, Whitby 2000a, 143 n.32; it actually extended the authority of the patriarchate of Constantinople, cf. Martin 1953, 440–2, Blaudeau 2006a, 408. It overturned all decisions and appointments made during Basiliscus' reign, which thus unseated patriarchs Peter of Antioch and Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria, as well as Paul, bishop of Ephesus. See Schwartz 1934, 190, Blaudeau 2006a, 188–9.

80 Peter was exiled to Pityus on the Black Sea, but escaped and sought refuge instead in Euchaïta: see Th. Lect. 415 (120.19–21) = Theoph. 125.17–19, Mal. 15.6. See van Esbroeck 1996, 468, Blaudeau 2006a, 190. On Paul see n.56 above; nothing further is known of his career.

81 Timothy Aelurus died on 30 or 31 July 477: see Stein 1949, 22 and n.1, cf. Frend 1972, 174. Thus he avoided a second expulsion. *Lib. Brev.* 16/106 alleges that he predicted the date of his own death (cf. Joh. Nik. 88.57) and committed suicide, see Blaudeau 2006a, 191 n.509; *V. Petr. Iber.* 110/80–1 recounts that just as the quaestor Martyrius arrived in Alexandria with news of Timothy's deposition, the patriarch died, cf. AK 326. On the ordination of Peter Mongus according to Alexandrian custom, by which the successor passed the night with the corpse of his predecessor and received the *pallium* from his hand, see Schwartz 1934, 190 n.4, Frend 1972, 176 (a custom wilfully misconstrued by Acacius in a letter to pope Simplicius in Schwartz 1934, 5.7–11). Peter (Mongus, a shortened form of the Greek *mogilalos*, 'stammerer', cf. Schwartz 1934, 172, or perhaps meaning 'with a hoarse voice', so Blaudeau 2006a, 358 n.463) is associated with Dioscorus and Timothy and had been archdeacon under the latter: see Grillmeier ii.4, 38/38, Davis 2006, 93, Blaudeau 2006a, 352, with *Lib. Brev.* 16/106, *Coll. Avell.*, ep.99.13 (p.445) and *Hist. Diosc.* 255 (a doubtful source, however). Blaudeau 2006a, 607, suggests that Zach. deliberately passes over Peter's earlier career in order not to allow him to be compared unfavourably with his predecessor. The ordination took place in secret and, according to some sources, was attended by only one bishop, thus casting doubt on the legitimacy of the ceremony (which required three) – hence the insistence here of Zach. on the regularity of the succession. See Th. Lect. 416, *Coll. Avell.*, ep. 99 (p.447.9), Schwartz 1934, 5.10, 81.26 with 190 n.4. PZ vi.2c reports that the bishop concerned was Theodore of Antinoë. Blaudeau 2006a, 192 n.511, points out, however, that Chalcedonian Egyptians (hence hostile witnesses) conceded that he had been ordained by two bishops, Evagr. iii.20.

A synod in Constantinople in late 476 or early 477 condemned these leading anti-Chalcedonian figures: see Lebon 1909, 29, Grumel 1972, no.150, Grillmeier ii.1, 282/249, Feld 2005, 291.

b. Then the bishops of Asia wrote to Acacius a *libellus* criticising the *Encyclicon* and they signed the *Antencyclicon*.⁸² Likewise, the [bishops] of the east wrote a *libellus* also condemning the *Encyclicon* to Calendion, who became [bishop of Antioch] after Peter.⁸³ But Anastasius of Jerusalem, who possessed the three provinces of Palestine, persevered in his truth and did not sign [the *Antencyclicon*] and did not renounce the *Encyclicon*, though he openly associated with the bishops who visited him.⁸⁴ Likewise, Epiphanius of Magdalon [220] in Paphlagonia withdrew to Alexandria out of the magnanimity of his soul and dwelled with the monks there and was honoured by Timothy and his successor Peter.⁸⁵

c. When Emperor Zeno heard about Peter he became very angry and sent threats of which [Peter] became aware beforehand, so he hid himself in the city, moving from one house to another. By order of emperor Zeno, Timothy Wobblecap, who had been banished, returned and received the cathedral church,⁸⁶ and at his arrival there was unrest and killings.⁸⁷ Theoctistus the

82 See Evagr. iii.9 for extracts from their petition, from which it is clear that Zach. was heavily critical of this *volte-face*, an element evidently excised by PZ. See Allen 1980, 480, eadem 1981, 129, Whitby 2000a, 144 n.36, Blaudeau 2006a, 591 and n.55, 657 and n.6.

83 Patriarch of Antioch, 481–4, but not the immediate successor of the deposed Peter: the anti-Chalcedonian John Codonatus succeeded in taking over the see briefly in late 476. A Chalcedonian patriarch, Stephen, was then installed, who was brutally killed during a riot in 479; a second Stephen may also briefly have held the throne, see PZ iv n.211 above. See Stein 1949, 20–1, Frend 1972, 175, Allen 1981, 129–30, Grillmeier ii.1, 282/250, Whitby 2000a, 144 n.37, Blaudeau 2006a, 195–6.

84 Perrone 1980, 126, suggests that Anastasius' loyalty to the *Encyclicon* was probably determined by the delicate balance he was maintaining in his see: forces favourable and opposed to the council were evenly matched, cf. Steppa 2005, 12–14. Blaudeau 2006a, 191 n.507, attributes Anastasius' survival as patriarch, despite his refusal to sign, to the fact that he could not be accused of having usurped his position.

85 Epiphanius is mentioned also in Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 44 (pp.95–6), cf. 75 (p.139) according to which he was obliged to move from his see first to Jerusalem, then to Alexandria, and finally to Maiuma. See also Sev. *Lett.*, ep. i.1 (7–8/7–8) and Blaudeau 2006a, 303. He is probably identical with the Epiphanius who ordained the future patriarch Severus, Sev. *Lett.*, ep.ii.3 (248/221), cf. Zach. *Vit. Sev.*, 100, whom the latter buried in his own monastery in Palestine. Brooks in Sev. *Lett.*, p.vi n.7, doubts the identification, but Honigsmann 1951, 132–3, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 310/274, rightly accepts it. No other bishop of Mygdalon/Magdalon (or Magydon, as the place is also known) is recorded.

86 I.e. the Caesarian, see PZ iv n.18.

87 Cf. Evagr. iii.11 on Zeno's anger at the news of the election of Peter, with Schwartz 1934, 190–2, Grillmeier ii.1, 282/249, Blaudeau 2006a, 192–3: the emperor threatened Peter's followers with grave penalties if they did not transfer their allegiance to Timothy Wobblecap and considered Peter to have incurred the death penalty. The *augustalis* of Egypt, Anthemius, was ordered to expel Peter forthwith, Lib. *Brev.* 16/106, cf. *PLRE* ii, Anthemius 6. Such was

prefect of the city was searching for Peter in order to arrest him when a voice was heard, saying, 'I shall hide him and overshadow him, because he knows my name; he shall call me and I shall answer him; on the day of distress I shall sustain him and honour him.'⁸⁸ Timothy exerted himself by all ways and means to keep hold of the people with him, preaching the faith of Nicaea and of the 150 [bishops], confessing and agreeing with what had been done at Ephesus, and condemning Nestorius. He wrote in the diptychs and called out the names of Cyril and Dioscorus, and he did other things as well, but was not able to draw the people to him.⁸⁹

a. The sixth chapter of the same fifth book gives information concerning Martyrius of Jerusalem who [became bishop] after Anastasius, and who also preached to the people the true faith and condemned Nestorius and the Council of Chalcedon.⁹⁰

Martyrius of Jerusalem was also one of those who, following his predecessor Anastasius, separated himself from the *Antienycliclon* and was very

Peter's support, however, that he was able to elude those sent to capture him, cf. Joh. Nik. 88.58. He was obliged to remain in hiding for three years: see *Coll. Avell.*, ep.99.18–20 (pp.447–8), but evidently had sufficient support in Alexandria to be able to remain in the city, cf. Haas 1993, 303, Haas 1997, 320–1.

88 Psalm 90(91).14–15. Theoctistus was presumably Anthemius' successor as *augustalis*, so *PLRE* ii, Theoctistus 4, Cantarelli 1909, 406 no.155. Zach. refers to Theoctistus as 'hyparch', and it is possible that, as in the case of Pergamius (see below n.114), he is actually referring to the *dux* – in which case Anthemius and Theoctistus may have been contemporary office-holders, the first as *augustalis*, the second as *dux*. See also *PLRE* ii, Anthemius 6. AK 327 wrongly propose identifying Theoctistus with the Theognostus mentioned below.

89 The references are to the councils of Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381) and probably both councils of Ephesus (431 and 449). Timothy Wobblecap's strenuous efforts to reconcile the anti-Chalcedonians to his rule proved ineffectual, earning him simultaneously the distrust of the Roman papacy. See Schwartz 1934, 191, Grillmeier ii.4, 36–7/36–8, Haas 1993, 304, Haas 1997, 318, and above PZ iv.10d with n.107.

90 Patriarch of Jerusalem, 478–86; he had earlier been a monk in Egypt before moving to Palestine. Although Zach. portrays him as a staunch anti-Chalcedonian, Cyr. Scyth., *V. Euthym.* 43, outlines a letter from him to Zeno, complaining of the disturbances caused in Jerusalem by the separatists (*apokhistai*); during his reign their hard-line resistance was checked and diminished, *ibid.* 45, cf. Perrone, 128–9, Blaudeau 2006a, 439–40. He should not therefore be seen as an opponent of Chalcedon, but rather as wary of involving Acacius in his sphere of authority. His address, which follows, represents an attempt at a compromise with the moderate Miaphysites, sticking to the first three ecumenical councils and avoiding mention of Chalcedon, looking forward to Zeno's *Henoticon*; it was given probably in 479. See Schwartz 1939, 368–70, Grillmeier ii.1, 283–4/250–1, Chitty 1966, 101–2, Frend 1972, 174–5, Perrone 1980, 127–32, Blaudeau 2006a, 197–8, di Berardino 2006, 252–3. Brennecke 1998, 47 n.117, regards Martyrius' address as having little or nothing in common with the *Henoticon*, however.

concerned to unite the people. He convinced the good monk Marcian, and he accepted and admonished his colleagues, [221] but the others who did not accept him he expelled.⁹¹ They say that after he died, his disciple, a man deprived of sight, entreated God, ‘If what our master believes is correct, when I lay my eyes on his corpse, let them receive light,’ and he received light.

b. The public address⁹² of Martyrius.

‘Christ is our peace, he who made the two one and removed the wall that [stood] in the middle,⁹³ and with his flesh has destroyed enmity. For behold, the church is receiving her children: those who never willingly went far from her now have shown this to us, and it is time for us to say, ‘Glory to God in the highest, and peace on earth.’⁹⁴

c. For this reason, in the presence of the God-loving bishops we have received these chaste abbots and virtuous clerics⁹⁵ in order to declare before you, the rest of our brothers, that we do not have any true definition of the faith other than that into which we were baptised and by which we baptise, for they were baptised and believe like us. Then everyone who holds or has held or has taught an opinion opposing the definition of the faith of our 318 holy fathers, the bishops [who assembled at] Nicaea, which the 150 believing and true bishops [who met] in the imperial city upheld and confirmed, as well as the Council of Ephesus, let him be condemned. If anyone holds another teaching or opinion that has [arisen] here or there, whether in Ariminum⁹⁶ or in Serdica⁹⁷ or in Chalcedon, or in any other place, then as the apostle says, “If anyone preaches to you other than who we have preached to you, let him be condemned.”⁹⁸

91 Cyr. Scyth. V. *Euthym.* 45 alludes to these same events, describing how Marcian, who had founded a monastery near Bethlehem, summoned the separatists and persuaded them to decide whether to remain aloof from the church or to rejoin it by means of drawing lots; as a result, they came back to the fold with only a few exceptions. Perrone 1980, 129, argues that Cyril is probably here referring to a vote, cf. Schwartz 1939, 369–70. Evidently the situation was more tractable than in Egypt.

92 Gk. *prosphônêsis*. Schwartz 1939, 368, offers a Greek version of this address (translated from the Syriac!).

93 Ephesians 2.14.

94 Luke 2.14.

95 Following Brooks, PZT, 221 n.3, cf. PZV, i, 153 n.5, correcting ‘found fault with.’

96 The (Arianising) council of Ariminum took place in 359 during the reign of Constantius II: see Pietri 1995, 328–30.

97 Another pro-Arian council that took place under Constantius in 343. See Barnes 1993, 71–81, Pietri 1995, 299–306; also Blaudeau 2006a, 198.

98 Galatians 1.8.

d. Again, the same [Martyrius] spoke [222] as follows. 'If anyone teaches, innovates, maintains, or explains anything that is contrary to the tried and orthodox teaching of the faith of those holy 318 [bishops] or of the 150 bishops, or of those [bishops] of [the Council of] Ephesus, or has a different definition or faith, he is foreign to the holy church. See, I bear witness to you before God and his Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the companies of the angels.⁹⁹ Let no one lead you astray from this faith. The acknowledgement of your signatures is above in heaven, and you must give account before the fearsome and righteous judgment seat if you accept [any] addition or subtraction to the faith. I am innocent of your blood; I did not fail to tell you.'

e. The bishops were using [words] such as these, admonishing those who had separated from them. In Alexandria, none of the faithful consented to associate with Timothy [Wobblecap] or those with him. Then the monks and certain eloquent and discerning persons took counsel and made a petition to the administrators of the city,¹⁰⁰ and urged them that when Timothy [Wobblecap] should die, they would not again accept [as] bishop anyone else from his party, but would grant to them the faithful Peter, who had been properly made bishop but was in hiding. When the members of Timothy's party heard these things, they made a petition to the emperor and sent [it] through the priest John of the martyrion church of St John the Baptist, who was a monk and a Tabennesiot. They requested in [the petition] that when Timothy [Wobblecap] should die there should not be another bishop other than from his party, and that the citizens of Alexandria would not accept Peter.¹⁰¹

99 Cf. 1 Timothy 5.21.

100 Earlier translations had rendered this as 'cities', which led Haas 1993, 305, to suggest a wider initiative by Peter's supporters, taking in the cities of the eastern empire. The reference, however, must concern only Alexandria. See Blaudeau 2006a, 199 n.564.

101 On the lack of support for Timothy in Alexandria see n.60 above. The John sent to Constantinople is otherwise known as John Talaia, the latter name perhaps referring to a monastery at Aphrodito, so Pietri 1987, 283 n.15; his deputation was probably sent in winter 481–2, and he was accompanied by Gennadius, bishop of Hermopolis Parva, a relative of Timothy Wobblecap, *Lib. Brev.* 16/107. John was a monk from a Tabennesiote (i.e. Pachomian) monastery, probably that at Canopus which was a bastion of the pro-Chalcedonians; he was also an *oikonomos* (steward) of the church in Alexandria, an important office that Zach. perhaps deliberately overlooks. See Schwartz 1934, 195, Stein 1949, 22, Frend 1972, 177, Pietri 1987, 282–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 198–9. Allen 1981, 131 n.50, distinguishes two missions of John to Constantinople, on the first of which he was accompanied by Gennadius, but *Lib.* (and Zach.) mention only one visit, cf. Pietri 1987, 286 and n.31, Blaudeau 2006a, 199. The church of John the Baptist in Alexandria was situated on the site of the earlier Serapeum, in the south-west of the city, see Martin 1984, 222–3, McKenzie 2007, 244 and fig.400.

f. [223] When John appeared before the emperor, [the emperor] said to him, testing him, ‘It is right in Our eyes that you should become bishop there.’ For the emperor had previously learned that John was an associate of Julius the *magister militum*,¹⁰² who was preparing with Leontius and Euprepus¹⁰³ a rebellion against the emperor, because he had command over the armies of the emperor [in Egypt], and John had revealed [the emperor’s knowledge of Julius’ plot] to Julius. [John] said to the emperor, ‘I am not worthy,’ and [the emperor] ordered him to seek advice on this matter, because when he told Julius of this, [Julius/Illus] said to him, ‘Hide your intention and do not reveal it before the emperor,’ and so [John] swore before Acacius and the senators that he would never become bishop.¹⁰⁴

g. So the emperor made an order¹⁰⁵ and gave it to John, that anyone of the clergy whom the people of the city should choose ought to become bishop after Timothy. But when [John] reached the city he delivered a letter

102 Gk, *stratēgos*. Julius is in error for Illus. See n.104 below.

103 The reference is, of course, to Pamprepius. See next note.

104 Lib. *Brev.* 16/107 confirms the close links forged between Illus and John during the latter’s sojourn in Constantinople. Illus, an Isaurian like Zeno, was a long-standing rival of the emperor, who had initially accorded his support to Basiliscus during his usurpation, but had then defected to Zeno. In the aftermath of Zeno’s return Illus became *magister officiorum* and a powerful force at court, keeping the emperor’s brother Longinus hostage in Isauria. Zeno made repeated attempts to eliminate him in 477, 478 and 481, so that at last in late 481 or early 482 he left the capital, determined to launch an open rebellion in collaboration with his adviser Pamprepius. John must therefore have met him very shortly before his departure. Zach.’s emphasis on John’s perjury is at least in part due to his partisanship: it was probably standard procedure to refuse office when first offered it, cf. Pietri 1987, 288, Blaudeau 2006a, 200, PZ iii n.112. His insistence on John’s collaboration with Illus may also be open to doubt: see Peeters 1936, 153–5, criticising Schwartz 1934, 196 and n.4. On Illus and Zeno see Brooks, 1893, 218–22, Stein 1949, 9–19, Lippold 1972, 180, *PLRE* ii, Illus 1, Feld 2005, 265–8.

The revolt that thus started in 482 led in due course to the proclamation of Leontius, then a *magister militum* (*PLRE* ii, Leontius 17), as emperor in Tarsus by Verina, wife of Leo I, in July 484, and the brief installation of an alternative imperial government at Antioch. The rebellion was swiftly crushed, although it was not until 488 that the rebels’ stronghold at Papirius in Isauria was taken and Illus and Leontius executed. See Brooks 1893, 222–31, Stein 1949, 28–31, Lippold 1972, 169, 185–91, Elton 2000b, 399–404, Feld 2005, 271–6. Pamprepius, an Egyptian, whom Zach. calls Euprepus, was in Egypt in early 482, seeking to drum up support for the incipient rebellion; whether the efforts of an outspoken pagan were aided by John, by then probably back in Egypt and elected patriarch despite his oath (*contra* Peeters 1936, 154), may be doubted. See *PLRE* ii, Pamprepius, Feld 2005, 272–3, Watts 2010, 72.

105 According to Schwartz 1934, 195 and n.5, a *mandatum*. A letter of pope Gelasius about the affair (in Schwartz 1934, 33) adds that Zeno praised John to the Alexandrians, thus apparently backing his succession, cf. Pietri 1987, 287 and n.32.

from Julius to Theognostus the prefect there,¹⁰⁶ who was also in on Julius' secret, and he promised that if he became bishop he would give [him] those imperial vessels that had been dedicated for the sanctuary and which Emperor Arcadius had donated to Theophilus, the bishop at that time, [who] had built the church there and named it after his [Arcadius'] name.¹⁰⁷

a. The seventh chapter of the same fifth book gives information concerning John who lied, gave a bribe, and became bishop after the death of Timothy [Wobblecap], and about Cyrus the priest who joined with him, and how Peter returned to his see.

After a few more days of life Timothy [Wobblecap] died, and John gave a bribe to Theognostus the prefect, broke his oaths, and became bishop.¹⁰⁸ He recruited for himself Cyrus, a priest from among those who at one time were associated with Dioscorus but who [later] abandoned him because he was also desirous for the primacy. At one time he was associated with Acacius of Constantinople, and at another time [224] with Timothy who had just died; at another time he cursed and reviled Timothy the Great [i.e. Aelurus] and Peter his successor, so that the Alexandrians would ridicule him because of [his] changes: they would show him unripe dates in the market place and charge him with adultery.¹⁰⁹ The late¹¹⁰ Dioscorus used to curse him, saying, 'God can be believed, that Cyrus shall die a layman.' And so it happened to him, as is written below.

106 *PLRE* ii, Theognostus 2, *augustalis* in 482, cf. Cantarelli 1909, 406–7 no.156. He is mentioned only by Zach. and Eutyh. *Ann.* 107 (*PG* 111, 1057), where he appears as Ebn Gustus.

107 Joh. Nik. 83.37 refers to a church built by Theophilus (mistakenly 'Timothy' in Charles' tr.) in honour of Theodosius I's son Arcadius, see McKenzie 2007, 246 and Martin 1984, 224 with n.79. As Blaudeau 2006a, 201, notes, John would have had access to such treasures as steward.

108 Timothy Wobblecap died in February 482, see Schwartz 1934, 196 and n.3, cf. Stein 1949, 22, Blaudeau 2006a, 201 (between February and April). The chronology thereafter is not clear: Zach. implies that John's election was almost immediate, but this need not have been the case, cf. Pietri 1987, 289 n.39.

109 Lit., 'and taunt him with the woman of a man.' Blaudeau 2006a, 594 n.181 proposes an identification of this Cyrus with a former doctor and philosopher noted by Gennadius of Marseilles and Ennodius, as well as with a theological adviser of Timothy Aelurus. It seems more likely, however, that the last of these is rather to be identified with the Cyrus mentioned at iv.12ff, cf. n.190 *ad loc.* Zach. is not implying that Cyrus was literally an adulterer, it should be noted, but rather highlighting the mockery that people made of his inconsistency (*contra* Haas 1993, 306 n.40). Blaudeau 2006a, 446 n.294, suggests that Cyrus may have been some sort of agent for Acacius in promoting his policies at the time of his association with him. The allusion to unripe dates, which are generally yellow or green, is obscure.

110 Lit., 'the peaceful soul'.

b. When the emperor heard these things concerning John he became enraged because he had broken his oaths and had become bishop.¹¹¹ Now in Constantinople at that time there were experienced monks who were pleading on behalf of Peter and they demonstrated [to the emperor] in the letter that they had [brought] with them the sufferings [caused] by the Council [of Chalcedon] that from time to time had taken place in Alexandria and Egypt, and in the rest of the surrounding regions.¹¹² The emperor accepted them and gave an order that John was to be deposed from his seat because [he had] lied, and Peter was to return to the church, [provided] that he sign the *Henoticon*¹¹³ that Zeno had written and had sent to Egypt and to the Pentapolis and [provided that] he accept and associate with the rest of the bishops who agreed to the *Henoticon*, as well as those who were called there [in Alexandria] ‘Proterians’ who professed that their opinion was according to what is in the *Henoticon*, which had come about through the advice of bishop Acacius and had been sent with Pergamius the prefect who had just been appointed in Alexandria in place of Theognostus.¹¹⁴

c. When [Pergamius] reached the city, he managed the matter prudently.

111 Zeno was no doubt all the more displeased that he learnt of John’s elevation indirectly: John duly advised the pope, the emperor and patriarch Acacius of Constantinople of his accession, but in the last two cases his message was to be transmitted through Illus, whom he believed still to be in Constantinople. When the messenger failed to find him there, he proceeded to Antioch to deliver the announcement, thus offending Zeno and Acacius. See *Lib. Brev.* 17/110–11 with Frend 1972, 177, Pietri 1987, 290, Blaudeau 2006a, 202.

112 The success that these representations had with the emperor is evident from Zeno’s insistence on Peter’s popularity in his letter to pope Simplicius (which has not survived, but is alluded to below, v.9b), cf. Simplicius’ letter to Acacius, *Coll. Avell.*, ep.68 (pp.151–2), and his reply to Zeno, Schwartz 1934, 3. See Schwartz 1934, 199, Blaudeau 2006a, 202, 339–40. The *Henoticon* itself refers to representations made to the emperor for unity, no doubt alluding to this one (among others). See also *Lib. Brev.* 17/111, noting the hostile reports circulated by Acacius and Gennadius of Hermopolis Parva about John, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 203.

113 Zach. gives the entire document at v.8; see below for discussion. The term itself might be translated as a ‘unifying [document]’.

114 Pergamius was the brother of the Chalcedonian holy man John the Hesychast, whose *Life* was composed by Cyril of Scythopolis: see *V. Ioh. Hesykh.* 3 (203.5–7). *Lib. Brev.* 17/112 refers to him as the *dux* of Egypt, while Zach., who refers to him as the hyparch (i.e. prefect), implies that he was the *augustalis*. This is problematic, for in the same place Liberatus names Apollonius as the *augustalis*. It is hard to determine which source should be accepted. See Cantarelli 1909, 391–2, 407–8, *PLRE* ii, Pergamius 2, Apollonius 5, and above n.88 (on Anthemius). On Acacius and the *Henoticon* see below n.121. Theoph. 130.9–21 offers a similar (but hostile) account of how Zeno was persuaded to support Peter.

Discovering that John had fled,¹¹⁵ he sought for Peter, and informed him of what the emperor had commanded. He showed him the *Henoticon* and he said, ‘Once you have studied it, the emperor commanded that you must sign it and agree to it, and [225] you must receive the bishops and the others who were from the party of Proterius without any resentment if they have agreed to all that the emperor has commanded in the *Henoticon*.’ When Peter had considered all that was in the document, he found that what it contained was entirely correct and faithfully rendered, but he hesitated, because it did not expressly and explicitly condemn the Council or the Tome, [and] because of this the people might have stumbled. However, he accepted it because it accepted the definition of the faith of the 318 [bishops] and proclaimed and confessed the truth of 150 bishops, and agreed to the Twelve Chapters of Cyril, and condemned Nestorius and Eutyches, and confessed that the body of Christ that was [taken] from the virgin was of our nature. He signed it and moreover he promised that he would receive into communion any other [cleric] from among all the [clerical] ranks who repented and accepted all that was in the *Henoticon* and persuaded the people [of their sincerity].¹¹⁶

d. Then the prefect, the *dux*, the important men, the clergy, the monks, the sisters, and the faithful people assembled where he was and seated him on a chariot, and as he was borne about he was praised as a keeper of the true faith, and honouring him they brought him to the cathedral church.¹¹⁷ Pergamius urged him to accept the rest of those from the party [of Proterius], but first [Peter] proclaimed the explanation of the meaning of the text of the *Henoticon* to the people and informed them saying, ‘It is well written according to the faith, accepts the Twelve Chapters of Cyril, condemns Nestorius and Eutyches, confesses that the body of Christ that was from the virgin is of the [same] nature as our own, [states that] the sufferings that were in the flesh and the miracles that he did were of the same Christ God, and [226] this writing annuls and rejects the entire opinion of the Council and of the Tome, because Dioscorus and Timothy the Great also thought and interpreted in a manner similar to [the *Henoticon*].’¹¹⁸

115 John fled initially to Antioch, where he was supported not only by Illus but also by the Chalcedonian patriarch, Calendon. He wrote to appeal to Rome and then left for the city himself in spring 483. See Pietri 1987, 291–2, Blaudeau 2006a, 202, 479–80.

116 Cf. Evagr. iii.13, drawn from Zach., and Th. Lect. 424 (emphasising John’s popularity in Alexandria at the time of his departure). As will be seen below, Peter’s hesitation was justified, since most Egyptians insisted upon a more explicit condemnation of Chalcedon and the Tome. See Lebon 1909, 33, Allen 1981, 132, Maraval 1998b, 119–21, Davis 2006, 96–7.

117 See n.86 above.

118 As Haas 1993, 306 and Watts 2010, 167 point out, Peter and Pergamius orchestrated a

e. [Peter] again made an address to the people as follows.¹¹⁹

‘It is right for us, along with the women and children, to offer, with the opening of the mouth in thanksgiving, prayer and supplication to our Lord and our God for the believing reign of the victorious emperor Zeno, whose correct actions and virtuous conduct urge on the discerning everywhere in this regard. For when the monks, our chaste fathers, presented him with a petition concerning the setting right of the faith, and informed him of what had recurred from time to time through confusion,¹²⁰ he suffered with us, wept, looked to heaven, and cried out to God to help him, and to sow in his mind to command things that are in agreement with the will of God, for the welfare of humanity and for the unity of the people, being concerned to remove the obstacles that were in all the churches because [of] the things that were insolently innovated and [that] came to be through the addition [to the faith] at Chalcedon. Now the light of the correct faith of our holy fathers has dawned upon us in this statement of the faith [of Zeno] that will be read before you, and will be heard in your ears, beloved children, because while [Zeno] professes in them the true faith and accepts the Twelve Chapters of the blessed Cyril, he [also] condemns Nestorius and Eutyches, and proclaims that the Word of God that became flesh was one nature, [in] sufferings and [in] miracles, rejecting the entire opinion of the Dyophysites, because these [words] are against their teaching and the Tome, against which our holy fathers Dioscorus and Timothy, the true martyrs of Christ, contended. But pray for him, [227] that our Lord may preserve him in the ideal of the truth of his love and of his faith. For we hope that, by the love of Christ our God, when your praises and prayers are heard by him, he will not deprive us of anything of those other things that we ask of him rightly, but rather he will accept your petitions and verifiably answer your requests. Hear the honourable document of the *Henoticon*, which he faithfully ordained, and which will now be read before you.’

careful *mise en scène* in order to win the support of the Alexandrians for the *Henoticon*. Evagr. iii.13 adds (presumably based on the complete Zach.) that Peter’s allocution took place during a public festival; Th. Lect. 426 (117.17–18 = Theoph. 130.18–19) reports that Acacius enjoined Wobbe-cap’s supporters to accept the document, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 207. Peter naturally sought to cast the document in as anti-Chalcedonian light as possible. See also Grillmeier ii.4, 39/39–40, Whitby 2000a, 146 n.42.

¹¹⁹ A *prosphônêsis*. The address is CPG 5497. On the context see Dovey 1988, 180–1.

¹²⁰ Or ‘avarice’.

a. Chapter eight: the *Henoticon* of Zeno.¹²¹

121 The document (CPG 5999) is preserved in Greek in Evagr. iii.14, Schwartz 1927b, 52–4, Nic. Call. xvi.12, as also in Latin, Lib. *Brev.* 17/113–17. PZ provides a full version of the document (*contra* Allen 1981, 132, who claims that the full version would have been in Zach.'s original but has been 'truncated' in the epitome). Sections are preserved in Latin by Facundus, *Def.* 12.4 (PL 67.845–8), in Coptic (much abbreviated, Amélineau 1888, 216–20) and in Armenian (tr. Conybeare 1905, 735–7). *RSCC*, 925–7, offers an English translation of Evagrius' version (scrupulously recording variants, which we have therefore not noted below, save where significant), cf. Whitby 2000a, 147–9 and Salaville 1919, 390–4 (a literal French tr. of Evagrius). Zach.'s version and that in Schwartz 1927b are more reliable than Evagrius', but the differences are minor, see AK 328–9, Festugière 1975, 486–8, and Allen 1981, 132. It should be noted that, unlike Basilicus' *Encyclicon*, Zeno's document is not an imperial edict (Lat. *edictum*, a general declaration of the emperor with legal force) but rather an address (*prospōnēsis*, Lat. *allocutio*), carrying with it no sanction against those who opposed it: see Evagr. iii.13 (p.110.28–30) Dovey 1988, 177–84 and Blaudeau 2006a, 203–4, 465, 615–16 and n.223. Grillmeier ii.1, 285/252, is misleading on this point.

The *Henoticon* was perhaps issued on 28 July 482, see (e.g.) Frend 1972, 177, but the matter remains uncertain, so Blaudeau 2006a, 203 n.590. Its architect was Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, see Salaville 1919, 394 with Evagr. iii.13, Theoph. 130.14–15; both he and Zeno had realised that Peter commanded the loyalty of by far the majority of the Egyptians and that an arrangement to bring him into communion was necessary, cf. v.7b above on lobbying by supporters of Peter in Constantinople. The document takes into account Alexandrian sensibilities (cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 288–9/255–6), and it is possible that Peter (or his supporters in Constantinople) had a hand in drafting it; nevertheless, the correspondence between Acacius and Peter preserved in Coptic, edited and translated by Amélineau 1888, 196–228 (also extant in Armenian, tr. Conybeare 1905, 721–39), which makes Peter out to be the initiator of the whole project, is clearly an invention, cf. Amélineau 1888, xxxi–xlvi, albeit perhaps one dating from as early as 490. See Blaudeau 2006a, 300 and n.235, 375–7, on the context of its fabrication, the same as that for the collection of documents in *Cod. Vatic. Gr. 1431*, i.e. Schwartz 1927b. Although it was addressed to the Egyptian church, the *Henoticon* was aimed at the whole empire, and in the short-term enjoyed some success, uniting once again the sees of Alexandria and Constantinople, even if it triggered a lasting breach with Rome (the Acacian schism, which lasted from 484 to 519). In the longer term, however, extremist anti-Chalcedonians forced Peter and his successors to condemn Chalcedon more roundly, straining relations between the two sees once again. It is thus generally viewed as an unhappy compromise, acceptable to both moderate supporters and opponents of Chalcedon, but destined to be brought to nothing by hard-liners on either side. In its insistence on restricting itself to the three earlier ecumenical councils and on remaining faithful to Cyril's teachings, it continues the tradition started by the *Encyclicon* and enunciated most recently by Martyrius at Jerusalem (v.6 above). As Brennecke rightly emphasises, the *Henoticon* is not a Miaphysite document, even if over time many interpreted it in this way: most of the opposition to it came initially from hard-line anti-Chalcedonians, cf. Perrone 1980, 133. See Salaville 1919, 396–7, Frend 1972, 177–83, Grillmeier ii.1, 285–90/252–6, Brennecke 1998, 42–51, Maraval 1998b, 119–20, Feld 2005, 291–4, Blaudeau 2006a, 205–6.

The political context of the document must be underlined: Zeno's position continued to be fragile as Illus' preparations for revolt gathered pace. John Talaia's association with Illus

‘[1]¹²² Zeno, Autocrator, Caesar, the believing and victorious emperor, glorious in victory, the great, ever-honoured Augustus: to the bishops and the people who are in Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and also in the Pentapolis.

[2] We know that the single, correct, and true faith is a foundation,¹²³ a buttress, and the invincible strength of our reign, that which through divine overshadowing the 318 holy fathers who assembled at Nicaea set down, and in like manner the 150 holy fathers of renown who were in Constantinople again confirmed it.¹²⁴ [3] By night and by day we are occupied with constant prayers, concern, and laws so that through [this faith] the holy catholic and apostolic church, that which is the incorruptible and imperishable mother of the sceptre of our empire, may be increased everywhere, while the believing people are offering acceptable prayers on behalf of our empire as they remain in peace and unity with God, with [228] the pious and holy bishops and the God-fearing clergy, abbots, and monks. For while the great God and our saviour Jesus Christ, he who became embodied from the holy virgin and Birthgiver of God Mary, praises and graciously accepts the confession and the service [that is made] out of concord, the races of enemies are shattered and wiped out; all persons bow their neck to our authority, which is after [that of] God; and peace and the benefits that are from it, seasonable temperature of the air, abundance of fruits, and all the things that are useful for humans are liberally given. [4] Thus, [for] this unblemished faith, preserving us and the affairs of the Romans, petitions have been presented to us from God-loving abbots, and others who are solitary [monks],¹²⁵ supplicating with tears so that there be unity in the holy churches, and that limb may be joined together with limb, those which the one who has been a hater of virtuous things has tried for a long time to separate, though knowing that one who makes war with the perfect body of the church is defeated.¹²⁶

helps to explain the emperor’s rapprochement with Peter Mongus. Illus and his supporters had widespread contacts, both in the west (with Odoacer) and in the east (with the Persians and Armenians). See Schwartz 1934, 201–2, Stein 1949, 27, Feld 2005, 272–4, 295. The success of the *Henoticon* (at least initially) denied Illus the possibility of gaining any support in Egypt, despite Pamprepus’ visit (see n.104 above). In fact, the pagan dimension of Illus’ revolt, personified by Pamprepus, provided Peter Mongus with an opportunity to unite supporters and opponents of Chalcedon in persecuting the remaining pagan elements in Alexandria: see Haas 1993, 310–15, Haas 1997, 325–30, Watts 2010, 234–43.

122 For the sake of convenience we include the section numbering system adopted by Grillmeier ii.1, 285–7/252–6. Meier 2009, 47–50, reproduces Grillmeier’s translation.

123 Lit. ‘a beginning’.

124 The councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381).

125 I.e. anchorites or hermits.

126 See v.7b and n.112 above on these representations.

b. For it has happened that in the countless generations whom time has removed every year from among the living, some of them departing while deprived of the washing of rebirth, [others] among them led off on the inevitable journey of humanity without having participated in divine communion, and myriads of murders [229] are boldly committed¹²⁷ so that not only the earth but even the very air is polluted with a profusion of blood. Who does not pray that [God] exchange these things for better ones? Because of this, we have been concerned that you know that we, as well as the holy orthodox churches everywhere and the God-loving priests who lead them, do not have and did not have either another symbol or teaching, or another definition of the faith, or a faith outside of that holy symbol of the 318 holy fathers mentioned above, which the 150 fathers gathered here [in Constantinople] have confirmed.¹²⁸ Anyone whom we know who possesses [a different faith] we consider a foreigner. For we are confident that this [symbol] alone, as we have said, is the preserver of our reign, and all the people who have been made worthy of life-giving baptism have received this [symbol] alone, and are baptised [into it]. [To this symbol] assented all the holy fathers who assembled at Ephesus, who also deposed the wicked Nestorius along with those who subsequent to him were of an opinion like his.¹²⁹ We also condemn Nestorius and with him Eutyches as people who have held opinions against that which has been stated.¹³⁰ We also accept the Twelve Chapters that were written by the God-loving [230] Cyril, worthy of memory, he who was the head of the bishops of the catholic church of Alexandria.¹³¹ We confess that the Only Begotten Son of God is God who in reality became a human being; our Lord Jesus Christ, who was of the [same] nature as the Father in divinity and was of our nature in humanity, who descended and became embodied from the Holy Spirit and from Mary, the virgin Birthgiver of God, and that the Son was one and not two. For we state that the miracles and the sufferings which he willingly endured in the flesh are of the one Only Begotten Son of God. We in no way accept those who separate [the natures], or confuse [them], or introduce a phantasm. For

127 Following Brook's correction from the MS, 'to be destroyed by myriads of killings'; see Brooks in PZT i, 229 n.1.

128 Lit. 'sealed'.

129 After the customary references to the councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381) the *Henoticon* here refers to the third ecumenical council at Ephesus (431).

130 For the condemnation of both figures together see above v.4f.

131 Cf. Martyrius' address, v.6b-d, which did not go as far as this, mentioning neither Eutyches nor Nestorius, nor the Twelve Chapters (i.e. the Twelve Anathemas) of Cyril (of 431), see Perrone 1980, 132. On Cyril's Twelve Chapters see PZ iii n.23.

the true and sinless embodiment from the Birthgiver of God did not cause the addition of a son, for the Trinity remained [a Trinity] even though God the Word, who is one of the Trinity, became embodied.¹³²

c. Then be united without doubting, since you know that neither the holy orthodox churches everywhere, nor the God-loving priests who lead them, nor our own kingdom has accepted and does not accept another decree or definition of the faith outside of that which the holy teaching has stated. For we have written these things not to create a new faith, but to reassure you. We condemn anyone who has believed or does believe anything different now or at any time, whether at Chalcedon or in any other synod,¹³³ especially Nestorius and Eutyches who have been mentioned, and all those who are of their opinion. Therefore, cleave [231] to the spiritual mother, the church, while delighting in her with us in divine communion according to the definition of the faith which has been stated above, that is the only [faith] of the holy fathers. For our most holy mother the church longs for you, to embrace you as beloved children, and for a long time has desired to hear your sweet voice. Therefore hurry, for in doing this you attract the pleasure of the life-giving Christ our God to you and you will be glorified by our empire.¹³⁴

a. The ninth chapter of the same fifth book is about the Separatists.

When these things had thus taken place, some of those who were ardent¹³⁵ became indignant because in the text of the *Henoticon* of the emperor there was no explicit condemnation of what had been done by way of addition [to the faith] at Chalcedon. However, all of them remained in communion with

132 The reference to a ‘phantasm’ is to the docetist aspect of Eutyches’ heresy, which held that Christ’s flesh was not real and that he did not genuinely participate in human nature. Cf. *RSCC*, 932 n.84. Zeno is here consciously rejecting Leo’s Tome, which referred (*Acts Chalc.* II.22 [Gaddis and Price 2005, ii, 19, *ACO* ii.1.1, p.15]) to one nature of Christ suffering and another one healing: see Gray 1979, 29, Maraval 1998b, 119–20, Brennecke 1998, 45, Blaudeau 2006a, 265. See also Chadwick 2001, 594, detecting parallels between the *Henoticon* and the Reunion of 433 (between Cyril of Alexandria and his Antiochene opponents).

133 Brennecke 1998, 46 n.113, suggests that ‘whether at Chalcedon or in another synod’ is a later addition, since it breaks up the structure of the phrase, probably by Miaphysites, which Blaudeau 2006a, 206 n.606, rejects. The reference immediately below, at v.9a, rather implies, however, that Chalcedon was not implicitly mentioned.

134 Evagr. iii. 14 concludes his transcription of the edict by recording that all the Alexandrians were then brought back into communion (i.e. with Constantinople). See also Schwartz 1927b, 54.21, for an extra line to be found in the *Vaticanus graecus* version, probably a later addition, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 204, 374 and Dovere 1988, 187 (*contra*).

135 AK 329 justly infer from this reference to the ‘ardent’ that Zach. is critical of their stance.

Peter because of his defence to them and especially because he stated that, 'The emperor shall not make us want for anything that we might ask from him.' The rest of the Proterians, seeing what had happened, went off to a suburb alongside the city [of Alexandria] called Canopus, and were crying out nasty slogans. But they were weak and few, and their leaders were some readers and Cyrus the priest, whom we mentioned above, who at one time associated with Dioscorus but [later] abandoned him.¹³⁶ When Pergamius learned of these things he had Cyrus brought in and he spoke with him, and he agreed [232] to do whatever was told to him. So he went back and with diligence said to those who were with him in Canopus, 'It is right for us to be united with our friends and to obey the order of the emperor.' But when the zealous and believing priests who were with Peter heard, they were greatly distressed, and they refused [to hold] communion with Cyrus; though they received many of those with him who had signed the *Henoticon* and condemned those who believed other than what was in it, they refused Cyrus [himself]. Even when he too signed they did not accept him, for they said to Pergamius that the sight of him would be sufficient to recall to the people his deeds and to cause many to stumble. So Cyrus remained a layman and died thus, according to the curse of the holy Dioscorus.¹³⁷

b. Then all of them were entirely in communion with Peter [of Alexandria], Peter the Iberian,¹³⁸ famous for his miracles, the monk Isaiah, practitioner [of asceticism],¹³⁹ and the rest of the Palestinians, the blessed monks of [the monasteries of] Romanus and Theodore.¹⁴⁰ Then Peter the bishop of

136 I.e. the Chalcedonians, faithful first to Proterius, then to Timothy Wobblecap, now, since the departure of John Talaia, without a rallying figure. See Salaville 1920, 50 (with Th. Lect. 430). On Canopus, see above n.101; on Cyrus, above n.109. See Haas 1993, 307, Haas 1997, 323–4, on the difficulties caused to Peter by these opponents.

137 Cyrus thus was persuaded to desist from his opposition to the *Henoticon* and apparently convinced some of his followers to do likewise. Hard-line anti-Chalcedonians (termed 'Ultras' by Chadwick 2001, 597) refused to accept his own transferral of allegiance, however, since they did not find his defection credible or sincere; cf. the case of Flavian of Antioch, whose acceptance of the *Henoticon* likewise proved insufficient for him to retain his position, PZ vii. n.177. See v.7a above on Dioscorus' prophecy.

138 On whom see PZ iii.4a.

139 Gk. *praktikos*, cf. PZ iv n.15 for our translation. Zach. was the author of a biography of this Isaiah, *V. Isa.*, cf. Kugener 1900, 467 and p.13 above. He began his ascetic life in the desert of Scetis, then moved to Palestine, near Gaza, becoming a hard-line opponent of Chalcedon, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 73 (p.128) and 12 (pp.27–8), *V. Petr. Iber.* 101–2/138, with Horn 2006, 152–70. He died on 11 August 491.

140 See Perrone 1980, 136–7, on Peter Mongus' links with the anti-Chalcedonians of Palestine. The support of these staunch Miaphysites will undoubtedly have bolstered his

Alexandria sent Paul who is called Arcadius to the emperor concerning some corrections.¹⁴¹ But John who had been bishop journeyed to Rome, and while weeping made known there to Patriarch Simplicius what had happened to him and said that he remained in danger for the sake of the Council and the Tome.¹⁴² When the emperor heard [of this] he wrote a letter to Simplicius

position. Zach. is naturally keen to emphasise the concord that prevailed at this point. The *V. Petr. Iber.*, on the other hand, tends to place Peter the Iberian rather in the camp of the hard-line Miaphysites, cf. Horn 2006, 166–7 and n.269; it provides no confirmation of this communion between the two Peters. Cf. the divergent traditions concerning Isaiah, who, according to one account (in Nau, *PO* 8 [1912], 164–5, perhaps part of the *Plerophoriae*) advised two Chalcedonian monks to maintain their beliefs, cf. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* p.27 n.2 with Nau 1902b, 66–7, Grillmeier ii.3, 99–100 (arguing that this is an interpolation), Blaudeau 2006a, 275 n.36. On Romanus see PZ iii.3d and n.110: he was still abbot of his monastery at Eleutheropolis, cf. Chitty 1966, 101. Given the association with another Palestinian, Theodore here may well refer to Theodore of Ascelon, a follower and heir of Peter the Iberian, who took over his monastery after his death together with John of Canopus: see Zach. *V. Sev.* 86–7 and *V. Petr. Iber.* 191/144, see further PZ vii.10d. An identification with Theodore, bishop of Antinoë, originally a monk in Egypt and made a bishop by Timothy Aelurus, *V. Isa.* 3/3, is also possible (on whom see also Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 38 [p.89] with n.2, and perhaps *Pleroph.* 33 [p.76]). Zach. *V. Sev.* 78 refers to Theodore (of Antinoë) in conjunction with Peter and Isaiah and other stalwarts of the anti-Chalcedonian camp (of all of whom he composed biographies, see Kugener 1900, 465–7), cf. *Sev., Coll., PO* 12 (1915), ep.38, 294 (where he is mistakenly referred to as Theodosius), and Blaudeau 2006a, 275 n.136. Given that at vi.1b Zach. refers specifically to Theodore of Antinoë, it seems more likely that this reference is to Theodore of Ascelon.

141 Not otherwise known. Nor is it clear what the ‘corrections’ might be, save that Peter no doubt pressed Acacius to be as critical of Chalcedon as was possible, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 323.

142 John arrived in Rome in early 483: see Salaville 1920, 51, Pietri 1987, 292, Blaudeau 2006a, 209 and n.631. Acacius had communicated little with pope Simplicius, despite the pope’s requests to patriarch and emperor to remove Peter Mongus from Alexandria; when he had written to him, it was to justify his support for Peter Mongus on the grounds of unity and to obey the emperor, so Lib. *Brev.* 17/120–1. Simplicius died on 10 March 483 and was succeeded three days later by Felix (III). John Talaia’s indictment of Acacius and his communion with Peter Mongus was addressed to Simplicius but handed to Felix after the former’s death, thus leading to Zach.’s error (followed by Evag. iii.15), so Blaudeau 2006b, 155 and n.97. The new pope wrote to Acacius in strong terms, then sent a legation to Constantinople to resolve matters. When his representatives, having been lured into communing with Acacius at a service where the names of Dioscorus and Peter Mongus were included in the diptychs, returned to Rome, they were dismissed and Acacius excommunicated, thus beginning the ‘Acacian schism’ (28 July 484). See Salaville 1919–20, Schwartz 1934, 200–9, Frend 1972, 181–2, Blaudeau 2006a, 348.

From Evagr. iii.18 it appears that Zach. dealt with these events in some detail, for his successor was at pains to discredit his account. He also claims that his version of events was mutilated here and hence brings other sources to bear. See Allen 1980, 483, eadem 1981, 135, Blaudeau 2006a, 667, Introduction B (3)(iv).

through Uranius¹⁴³ the tax collector, in which he informed him [of] all John's cunning and lies and made known that Peter had been appointed bishop in Alexandria by his command for the sake of the unity of the people.¹⁴⁴

c. But Calendion, [233] [the bishop] of Antioch, when he learned of these things that had taken place in Alexandria, became distressed and wrote to [bishop] Acacius [of Constantinople], to Emperor Zeno, and also to Simplicius of Rome, calling Peter [of Alexandria] an adulterer, and he praised the Tome and the Council.¹⁴⁵ He was devotedly attached to Nestorius because in his letter he called Cyril a fool. However, because he was helping Julius, Leontius and Euprepus¹⁴⁶ who had rebelled against emperor Zeno, and who were finally killed in the East, he was deposed from his place and Peter [the Fuller] returned to his see by order of the emperor, who once and twice had fought for the sake of the faith.¹⁴⁷ The Antiochenes received him

143 Gk. *praktêr*, which normally means a tax-collector, but here more probably refers to an *agens in rebus*, so *PLRE* ii, Uranius 4; he is also mentioned in the following chapter as a letter-bearer. *Coll. Avell. ep.* 99.22 (p.449.4) reports that he announced to Simplicius (in June-July 482, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 312 n.288) Zeno's intention of not confirming John Talaia as patriarch of Alexandria. He may also be identical with Uranius, the emissary said by Vict. Vit. *Hist. Pers.* iii.32 to have been sent to Carthage by Zeno in 484 to defend the interests of the orthodox there.

144 Evagr. iii.15 refers to a letter from pope Simplicius to Zeno as well as to the emperor's reply. As Allen 1981, 133, notes, the first of these has not survived. The second is referred to in *Coll. Avell., ep.* 68 (p.152.55–6, 15 July 482), *ep.* 99 (p.449.3–5), cf. Schwartz 1934, 163 (document 36), Blaudeau 2006a, 202.

145 Cf. Evagr. iii.16. The accusation of adultery was based on the fact that he had taken over the see of Alexandria when it was already occupied. Because of his opposition to the *Henoticon*, Calendion was exiled to Oasis in Egypt after the collapse of Illus' revolt, see Honigmann 1951, 4–5, Frend 1972, 181, Blaudeau 2006a, 211, idem 2008, 282–3. Brennecke 1998, 48 n.119, argues that Calendion was more opposed to Peter Mongus' appointment than to the *Henoticon* itself, *contra* Schwartz 1934, 209.

146 I.e. Illus, Leontius and Pamprepus, see nn.103–4 above.

147 In fact, they held out at their stronghold at Papirus until 488: see n.104 above on their revolt. On Calendion's fate see n.145 above and Whitby 2000a, 150 n.47. Peter the Fuller's second return to the patriarchate (and third tenure) lasted only from late 484 or 485 until his death in 487 or 488; his return to the see was roundly condemned by pope Felix. See Schwartz 1934, 210–11, Grillmeier ii.1, 292/258, Frend 1972, 181. Blaudeau 2006a, 220, cf. 432–3, argues that Acacius had intended John Codonatus to resume control of the see, but Zeno preferred to restore Peter, perhaps influenced by a visit of Philoxenus, who was himself soon appointed to the see of Hierapolis (Mabbugh) by Peter; Acacius at any rate never recognised Peter's return, Blaudeau 2006a, 222. Th. Lect. 443–4 (= Theoph.133.29–134.9) offers a hostile version of these events, noting nine bishops deposed ostensibly for having supported the rebellion, but (he claims) in fact because of their refusal to accept the *Henoticon*; they therefore informed pope Simplicius of this, blaming Acacius, cf. Salaville 1920, 51–2, Honigmann 1951, 5, Blaudeau 2006a, 432 and n.233.

with great ceremony and acclamations, as though he were Simon Cephas. [Peter] convened a synod of his province, reconciled and united the divisions and made [matters] right. The council that he assembled wrote a canonical letter of union to Peter of Alexandria as [follows].¹⁴⁸

a. Chapter ten of the same fifth book communicates the conciliar letter of the assembly of Antioch in the time of Peter [the Fuller] that was [addressed] to Peter of Alexandria. ‘To our God-loving holy father Archbishop Peter: [from] the Council that has assembled in Antioch. Just as Joshua Bar Nun, who exemplified types¹⁴⁹ of Jesus Christ our God, and who was the general who [acted] with care and solicitude on behalf of the rights of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, giving judgement according to the commandment of Moses who had bequeathed to him leadership, [when] they passed through the Jordan armed along with their brothers to the land of the promise which they inherited, helping them [234] in battle until God gave rest there in peace to their brothers as well as to them,¹⁵⁰ we likewise judge it to be a concern for Your Discernment, O pious [bishop], that we also, being armed, should reach Antioch, until even our eastern brothers receive the inheritance of their churches from God.¹⁵¹ We, being the bishops from Arabia, Phoenice Libanensis, Syria Secunda, Euphratesia, and Cilicia, who have become desirous of peace from the troubles and the conflicts that have happened

148 Evagr. iii.16 explains that Peter the Fuller had signed the *Henoticon*, which accounts for Zeno’s acceptance of his return. Evagr. omits the next documents, which are of course of more interest to the anti-Chalcedonian Zach. See Allen 1981, 133. As Blaudeau 2006a, 220 n.705, argues, despite Sev., *Lett.*, ep.iv.2 (287/254), it is unlikely that Peter Mongus condemned Chalcedon explicitly in his letters to Peter the Fuller and his successor Palladius at this stage.

Simon Cephas is a reference to Simon Peter, i.e. the apostle Peter; Cephas means ‘rock’ in Syriac. This first letter is CPG 6522 = 9142. On Zach.’s attitude to Peter see Blaudeau 2006a, 600 n.121: despite the positive portrayal here, he was viewed with distrust by some anti-Chalcedonians. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 22 (pp.47–8) reports the despatch of a similar letter to Martyrius of Jerusalem, cf. PZ vi n.76.

149 *razê*, ‘mysteries,’ here a reference to the fact that Joshua and Jesus had the same name in Greek, and that the former was a type, i.e. a foreshadowing, of the latter. See ODCC, 1649, on ‘types’.

150 Cf. Joshua 1.13–15. Blaudeau 2006a, 292 n.194, elucidates this analogy convincingly: Peter Mongus is the new Joshua, to whom Moses (Aelurus) has entrusted the leadership of his people. He has now restored the position of the tribes of Reuben, Gad and Manasseh, i.e. the Church of Antioch. The crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 4.12) he interprets as an allusion to the precedence that Antioch ought to enjoy over Constantinople.

151 This passage seems to refer to the taking back by force (or by divine intervention) of churches conceived of belonging to the anti-Chalcedonians by divine right.

to us now have been summoned by the letter of the tranquil emperor to be assembled in Antioch. Your beloved and glorious son, Uranius the tax collector,¹⁵² shall make known to you these matters, he who serving the will of the emperor and his command has informed us and shown [us] the letter that [was sent] from him to Your Holiness, to the order of the chaste monks, and to the faithful people.

b. We, having met together, received the rights of divine love from our believing father, Patriarch Peter, who demonstrated to us discerning calm and humility, with whom we are in union concerning all matters and he with us: we have been joined in the service of the spirit and honoured also by the people of his city whom he shepherds, who met and received him with joy and gladness, and with acclamations of praise, and extolled him as though [he were] Peter Cephas, our leader, the apostle.¹⁵³ Moreover, it was recounted to us what took place in the imperial city, how those under the authority of the holy archbishop Acacius had assembled by order of the emperor, and of the unity with him and with one another. He too wrote to Your Grace, demonstrating and making known the will of the faithful emperor and these things that are in the honourable text of the *Henoticon*, [235] that are in harmony with the entire truth of the faith of our holy fathers of Nicaea to which the 150 who were in the imperial city cleaved, and the assembly in Ephesus also confirmed, which took place in the time of Celestine and Cyril who in twelve chapters exposed and condemned the entire deceit of the teaching of Nestorius and of Eutyches, and the rest of the heresies.¹⁵⁴ Thus, these matters brought the Egyptians into agreement with the Easterners,¹⁵⁵ indeed, with all those everywhere who are lovers of peace and who desire unity and the true faith. We believe and hold as true that the diligence and prayers of Your Holiness have brought about these things for believing people everywhere, at the will of our Lord and our God Jesus Christ, whom we supplicate to guard for us the life of Your Chastity, prospering in every virtue, and rejoicing in our Lord over the things that were done on the entrance of your honoured brother and our chaste father. Through the diligence of your son Uranius, whom we commend to Your

152 On whom see n.143 above. Blaudeau 2006a, 312 n.288, points out that Zach. thus implies that Uranius had just been to Egypt before coming to Antioch.

153 Peter Cephas (i.e. the apostle Simon Peter, cf. n.148 above) had been increasingly associated with the church of Antioch from the fourth century: see Blaudeau 2006a, 289 n.186. Menze 2008a, 190, draws attention to the use of Matthew 16.18, a passage usually associated with the primacy of Rome, to underline instead the primacy of Antioch.

154 See v.8b-c above on these points, all contained in the *Henoticon*.

155 I.e. the Antiochenes, so AK 331.

Divine Love, may you write and send thanks to the faithful emperor, who with all his strength executes and administers the command of Divine Love and is diligent to unite the churches of Christ and to instill peace in her beloved children.’

a. The eleventh chapter communicates the letter of Acacius of Constantinople to Peter of Alexandria. Acacius, who had been supporting the Council,¹⁵⁶ abandoned his former intention and coming to love and agreement with what is in the *Henoticon* also wrote to Peter of Alexandria as follows.¹⁵⁷ ‘Our pious and God-loving fellow servant, our brother Peter: [from] Acacius, greetings. The name of peace gives delight, but its activity is sweeter. When it is accomplished according to the unity and the faith of the church [236] it gives an even greater grace to the discerning, and it produces in them joy, because it announces great things. While we were delighted with such great joys in the assemblies of our city, news was announced to us concerning your faith, and [at first] it troubled us and agitated and distressed many of the chaste monks who are here, as well as the people and our own esteemed clergy. However, when your honourable letter was given and conveyed to us and to the illustrious leaders, it dispelled every rumour of falsehood concerning you, and rolled away the smoky gloom, and it manifested the light and the clarity of your divine virtues, and [now] we have occasion to say, ‘Glory to God in the highest.’¹⁵⁸ For our great God and our Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ is producing ‘peace in the land’ of our faith and is manifesting the ‘good hope’ among human beings. Therefore, [with] that same glory which the angels in heaven in their assemblies first gave glory in the ears of the shepherds over the earth in Bethlehem, the shepherds and the pastors of the flock, its people, joined hand in hand in their unity and concord, now give the same glory to God our Lord, who is the head and the true shepherd of the flock. Now Christ’s illustrious star of the east is the believing and God-fearing emperor. Just as it guided those at that time to Christ our God to assemble at the cave and offer gifts for the honour

156 See above nn.21, 77 on Acacius’ attitude to Chalcedon. Zach. himself claims at iv.11c that he had been opposed to it from the outset.

157 This letter (CPG 5991 = Grumel 1972, no.166) bears no resemblance to any found among the spurious correspondence between the two patriarchs preserved in Coptic, on which see n.121 above. Evagr iii.17, by contrast, quotes a letter of Peter Mongus to Acacius in favour of Chalcedon, in order to demonstrate his inconsistency, the authenticity of which is doubted by Blaudeau 2006a, 215–17, 456–7.

158 Luke 2.14.

of his worship,¹⁵⁹ so this [time] he has caused the splendour of the true faith to shine forth, manifesting it to the entire world under his authority; he has removed ‘the partition wall that was in the middle,’ that separated and split the unity of the members of the [237] holy church, and has made it grow into a complete person of perfect stature, who in a single *hypostasis* and image has made manifest a single body, and has made one from two.¹⁶⁰ For we have come to understand from the thankful letter of Your Holiness that he too, like David, while prophesying and reigning, now has killed Goliath in the field with the cross alone, and striking the evil one with a sling has overthrown him, and has destroyed him by the faithful letter which he wrote.¹⁶¹ With the sword of the truth of the Spirit¹⁶² which he has displayed he has cut off and removed the heresies and the impediments that are the heads of the dragon, whom he has also cast ‘into the outer darkness’,¹⁶³ and has bound him and imprisoned him in the lower reaches of the earth.

b. Therefore, let Jerusalem above, the mother of the firstborn children rejoice and with the daughters of the church be glad, and sing glory to God; and praying for the victory of the emperor let her say, ‘Praise to the glorious Lord, who is greatly glorified.’¹⁶⁴ For we were amazed at the victory of God when we learned from your letter that the letter of the *Henoticon* had reached you, which had been sent from our presence in the hands of Pergamius to Your Piety, and that you had agreed to it. We praised your faith and we pray that our Lord protect the life of this faithful emperor, who has united us to the truth. I and those with me have written this letter of reply, greeting Your Chastity and that of the excellent clergy, chaste monks, and faithful people.’ The end of the letter of Acacius of Constantinople.

a. The twelfth chapter communicates the letter of Martyrius of Jerusalem, which he wrote to Peter, who was in Alexandria, as follows.¹⁶⁵ ‘[To] the

159 The placing of the infant Christ in a cave (rather than a stable) goes back to the apocryphal protevangelium of James (18.1, 19.1–3, 20.4, esp. 21.3, tr. Elliott 1993, 65) and enjoyed a wide circulation.

160 Cf. Ephesians 2.14–16, 4.13.

161 Cf. 1 Samuel 17.48–50.

162 Ephesians 6.17.

163 Matthew 22.13.

164 Cf. Exodus 15.1.

165 CPG 6515. Perrone 1980, 134, rightly points out that Martyrius’ letter is remarkably unspecific, containing no particular praise of the *Henoticon*. See Blaudeau 2006a, 221 and n.708, on the context of the letter: Martyrius may well have stalled before entering into communion with Peter Mongus.

pious and Christ-loving archbishop, my Lord and my brother and my fellow minister Peter: [from] Martyrius [238] of Jerusalem. We have the occasion now to say like the prophet, 'I praise you, Lord God, and I glorify your name, because you have done wonders, because your will is true of old. Amen, our Lord.¹⁶⁶ 'For our mouth is filled with praise and our tongue with praise,'¹⁶⁷ because we have seen the heart of the emperor in the hands of the Lord, who in truth constantly serves His will, and who has joined the divided members. Again, because we have received the letter of Your Charity, it is as though the prophet is crying out with us, 'Lift up your eyes about you, and look upon your children who are being gathered to you,'¹⁶⁸ because it is right that we be glad because of these things and that we greet Your Piety in our Lord. Singing with the prophet David we say, 'May the Lord increase you, you and your children; you are blessed by the Lord, he who made heaven and earth.'¹⁶⁹ I and those who are with me bow down deeply in the Lord to the priests who are with Your Chastity, the faithful people, and the pious monks.' The end of the letter of bishop Martyrius of Jerusalem.¹⁷⁰

166 Isaiah 25.1.

167 Cf. Psalm 125(126).2.

168 Isaiah 60.4.

169 Ps. 113(115).14, 15.

170 A scribe inserted at this point, at the end of the first volume of the work in the BL manuscript, 'Glory to the glorious Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, now and at all times and forever and ever, amen.'

BOOK SIX

a. [2] Part Six from the Chronicle of Zachariah, which contains seven chapters.¹ The first [chapter] concerns those who separated² from Peter, who had accepted the *Henoticon*. The second [chapter] concerns the *spatharius* Cosmas who was sent by Zeno, and the things that were done in Alexandria to the monks who had separated.³ The third [chapter] concerns the monks Peter and Isaiah. The fourth [chapter] concerns the prefect Arsenius who was sent to Alexandria, and the things he did to those who had split away. The fifth [chapter] recounts [to the reader] the letter of Fravitta of Constantinople to Peter. The sixth [chapter] recounts [to the reader] the letter of Peter to Fravitta. The seventh [chapter] gives an explanation of the chief priests⁴ in Zeno's time, and also about [the details] of Zeno's life.

a. The first chapter of the sixth discourse gives information concerning those who separated from communion with Peter, because in the *Henoticon* and in the letters of the chief priests to [Peter] there was no express anathema of the council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo.

When these things had been accomplished through the letters [containing] the *Henoticon* of Emperor [Zeno], and three [or] four [of the] chief priests had given [their] assent, [namely] those of Ephesus,⁵ Jerusalem, Alexandria,

1 PZ vi is by far the shortest book to survive in its entirety. From Evagr. iii.18 it is clear that much has been lost in this version of Zach., for Evagrius states that Zach. described the pressure brought to bear on popes Simplicius and Felix by John Talaia, which culminated in Felix excommunicating Acacius (in 484). According to Evagrius, Zach. also related how the Akoimetai presented the deed of excommunication to Acacius, although he regards his version as tendentious. See Schwartz 1934, 208–9, Frend 1972, 182–3, Whitby 2000a, 153 n.59, Blaudeau 2006a, 217–25, 555 n.328, with Th. Lect. 431–4 (= Theoph. 131.23–132.1, 132.20–33). It seems likely that PZ is responsible for the omission of these events.

2 Gk. *aposthistsai*, on which term see PZ v n.66.

3 That is, from communion with those who accepted the *Henoticon*.

4 We translate Syr. *reshay kahnê*, lit. 'heads of the priests', thus throughout.

5 No more is known of the communion of the metropolitan bishop of Ephesus with Peter Mongus: Zach. reported the deposition of Paul of Ephesus at v.5a, cf. *HEO*, 119. This section is repeated by Mich. Syr. ix.6 (255–6c/152–3). As Blaudeau 2006a, 298, remarks, the inclusion

and Antioch, along with the bishops who were under their authority, and were in agreement with one another as to the force [of the argument] of the tome of Zeno's *Henoticon*, and had accepted it and subscribed to it, the priests from Alexandria, Julian and John,⁶ and the deacons Helladius and Serapion,⁷ elders from the church there, and Theodore [3] the bishop of Antinoë,⁸ John, and another Egyptian, the *rabba*⁹ Andrew,¹⁰ Paul the Sophist,¹¹ and certain other monks separated themselves from communion with Peter of Alexandria, because there was no obvious anathema of the council of Chalcedon and of the Tome in the *Henoticon* and in the letters of the patriarchs to [Peter Mongus]. Little by little those who split off increased, [their number] being added to in many of the monasteries. When Acacius the bishop of the imperial city heard [of these things], he wrote to them exhorting them to assent [to the *Henoticon*].¹²

b. Now Peter was reviling the council in his public address and in the rest of his apologies that he made to the people. When Acacius finally heard [of] these things, he sent a priest of his own to investigate Peter [of Alexandria]'s statements¹³ and his faith. A hearing was conducted before the judge¹⁴ of the

of Ephesus among the patriarchates was part of a wider campaign to recognise the see's rights at the expense of those of Constantinople.

6 The priest Julian is also mentioned by Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 38 (p.89); see further n.52 below. AK 331–2 suggest that the two Johns here mentioned correspond to two Johns mentioned in the *V. Isa.*, the first an archimandrite and bishop of Sebennytyos (cf. *V. Isa.* 11/8, *V. Sev.* 78, Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 63 [p.120]), the second John 'of Penephusus' (*V. Isa.* 11/8). Schwartz, *ACO* ii.5, p.131, on Lib. *Brev.* 17/126, identifies the bishop of Sebennytyos with the abbot of the Diolcos monastery, mentioned as having been deposed by Zeno; he is also referred to as a hard-liner by Sev., *Coll.*, ep.39, *PO* 12 (1919), 298–9, although he appears to have moderated his stance eventually, cf. Moeller 1944–5, 97 n.3. Lib. *Brev.* 17/122 also mentions a John, bishop of Magilis (or possibly Metilis [in Lower Egypt], so Gelzer, followed by *HEO*, 596), who, along with the abbot Amun (on whom see PZ v.1a and n.10), forced Peter to condemn Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. It seems more likely therefore that the two Johns mentioned also in Lib. *Brev.* are those mentioned by Zach. (and not the otherwise unknown John 'of Penephusus'). Moeller 1944–5, 99–100, argues that these first chapters of PZ vi were Liberatus' principal source on events in Egypt, to which he added a few elements from other sources (sometimes rather garbled).

7 Not otherwise known.

8 See PZ v n.140 on Theodore.

9 *Rabba* is here an honorary epithet; see further vi.2b below on Andrew.

10 Not otherwise known.

11 The author of Basiliscus' *Encyclicon*, on whom see PZ v.1a and n.10 above.

12 Grumel 1972, nos.169–70 (late 485), cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 225.

13 Syr. *ḥe'ruta*, lit. 'freedom.'

14 Gk. *ekdikos*. An *ekdikos* (judge) normally judged minor cases or represented the city in cases involving the imperial administration; his involvement in ecclesiastical disputes was

city, and they saw¹⁵ that the synod was not expressly condemned by him,¹⁶ and when it was heard, it scandalised many.

c. When many questions had been [posed] to him by the abbot and the bishop who had separated [from communion with Peter],¹⁷ Peter the Iberian the bishop of Gaza who was sojourning there [in Egypt],¹⁸ and the monk Elias who was called Potter¹⁹ were appointed in order to consider and examine the facts. When they along with the assembly of monks had [finished] the examination, they selected four speeches of Peter concerning the faith and said to him, 'If you accept these, sign,'²⁰ and he signed, and certain [persons of those present] were united with him in this matter, because in these [statements] he had condemned the Council [of Chalcedon] and the Tome [of Leo] while speaking in the hearing of the people.²¹ However, there remained [4] others who did not want to associate with Peter, and when he saw [this] he confiscated the monastery of the bishop Theodore and expelled this miraculous man, who had opened [the eyes of] the blind by anointing

not without precedent, however. See Schwartz 1934, 199 with Blaudeau 2006a, 226. See also Grumel 1972, no.171, placing the investigation in 486 or 487.

15 Added from Mich. Syr. ix.6 (256c/153) with Brooks, PZT ii, 3.

16 Peter's dilemma became starker as opinions hardened. In order to retain the support of Acacius, he could not anathematise Chalcedon and the Tome; but if he was to maintain the fragile unity he had achieved in Egypt, it was necessary that he explicitly condemn the council. See Frend 1972, 187, Whitby 2000a, 151 n.50, Blaudeau 2006a, 225. Evagr. iii.16 likewise refers to Acacius' investigation, noting that Peter produced a document from certain people who denied that he had condemned Chalcedon openly, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 226, Watts 2010, 233–4.

17 These two individuals must be the abbot Amun and bishop John of Magilis, see n.6 above.

18 *V. Petr. Iber.* has no mention of a return to Egypt by Peter at this time, but it remains possible that Zach. is correct here. So Blaudeau 2006a, 226 n.731, cf. 275 (on Peter and Isaiah).

19 Not otherwise known, although he might be an Alexandrian monk: see Perrone 1980, 137 with Blaudeau 2006a, 226 n.731.

20 Lit. 'set your hand'. As Blaudeau notes, Peter was now jeopardising his ambiguous position, whereby he condemned Chalcedon orally without putting anything in writing. On Zach.'s attitude to Peter Mongus see PZ v n.140. The four works in question must have been recent ones, since otherwise their relevance would have been limited. See Blaudeau 2006a, 226 n.732, idem 2006b, 189 n.328.

21 *Lib. Brev.* 17/122 refers to a general rebellion in Lower Egypt led by John, bishop of Magilis (see n.6 above) and the abbot Amun (see PZ v n.10 above) and to Peter being obliged to condemn council and Tome in the Caesarian in Alexandria, although this last event may refer rather to the events described at PZ vi.2. See also Evagr. iii.22, Leontius, *De sectis, Actio 5*, PG 86.1229A–B. Amun, however, appears to have been among those satisfied by this declaration of Peter: see *Lib. Brev.* 17/126 with Blaudeau 2006a, 227 n.733 and n.45 below. *Lib. Brev.* 17/123 claims that Peter even went so far as to dig up Timothy Wobblecap's body and to cast it out of the city. See Haas 1993, 309.

[them] with water from the baptismal font.²² On account of this, the monks became upset, and they sent to Emperor Zeno one Nephalius, who had also been expelled by Peter, and this man was an agitator of the people.²³

a. Chapter Two of the sixth book tells about Nephalius who went up to the emperor and accused Peter, [and about] the *spatharius* Cosmas whom he [Zeno] sent, and what took place when he arrived.

Nephalius, a monk and one who [was known] from his activities to be an agitator of the people, was sent to go up to Emperor Zeno, bringing with him from his associates who had separated [from communion with Peter] a letter which made known that Peter had plundered, seized, and confiscated their monasteries. When the emperor learned of these events he became furious with Peter. He sent his *spatharius* Cosmas²⁴ with a letter threatening Peter, stating that the emperor had deigned to appoint [Peter] as bishop [in Alexandria] in order to unite the people so that they [might] not be divided into two factions.

b. When Cosmas arrived, it was this Nephalius who accompanied him.²⁵ The letter was given to Peter, and the monks were assembled in the

22 Faced with such intransigent opposition, a consequence of his continued contact with churchmen believed to sympathise with Chalcedon (notably Acacius) and to his generous treatment of defectors to his camp, Peter took a hard line. See Lebon 1909, 33, Schwartz 1934, 200, Moeller 1944–5, 84, Chadwick 2001, 597, Blaudeau 2006a, 227 (esp. n.742 on the miracle worked by Theodore) with Sev. *Sel. Lett.*, ep.iv.2 (287/254). The same miracle is related by Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 78.

23 Nephalius is also mentioned by Lib. *Brev.* 17/126, where he is referred to as an abbot. He was from Nubia (Joh. *Vit. Sev.* 231); see also Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 100–1, where he is equally critical of his appetite for conflict. He published an *Apology* c.508, which is generally viewed as a forerunner of the ‘neo-Chalcedonian’ movement, an effort to reconcile Chalcedonian christology with Cyril’s teachings: see Moeller 1944–5, Gray 1979, 105–11, Allen and Hayward 2004, 7–8, 39–40. Blaudeau 2006a, 577 n.440, suggests that Zach. had seen him in Alexandria and had thus taken a personal dislike to him. See also Blaudeau 2006a, 663–4, who brings out how Evagr. iii.22 wilfully distorts Zach.’s account here, giving the impression that Nephalius was a moderate, which led in turn to confusion in the manuscript tradition and among modern scholars. It is also possible, of course, that Zach. has overplayed Nephalius’ contentions here.

24 *PLRE* ii, Cosmas 3. He was a eunuch and was also ordered by Zeno to summon the holy men Isaiah and Peter the Iberian to Constantinople, a summons which they both refused. See *V. Petr. Iber.* 140/103–4, *V. Isa.* 13–14/9 and vi.3 below. The mission to Egypt here described took place in 487, see (e.g.) Stein 1949, 36. While Zach. calls him a *spatharius*, Evagr. iii.22 (120.17–18) refers to him as one of Zeno’s bodyguards, and Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 27 (p.68) calls him a *cubicularius* (chamberlain), cf. *V. Petr. Iber.* 140/103. On the post of *spatharius*, which was restricted (like that of *cubicularius*) to eunuchs, see Jones 1964, 567–8

25 As did a new *augustalis*, Theodore, known only from Olivieri 1898, 100–1: see Cantarelli

martyrion of the blessed Euphemia,²⁶ some thirty thousand men, among whom ten were bishops.²⁷ [The letter] charged them not to enter the city so that it would not be disturbed and a riot not take place. Then they chose from among them bishop Theodore; the priests John, Julian, and [another] John; the deacons Helladius and Serapion; the great-[abbot] Andrew, Paul the Sophist, and about two hundred abbots. They entered [5] the cathedral to [see] Peter²⁸ and many things were told to the *spatharius* Cosmas and the prefect of the city, and they read the letter of the emperor. When Peter spoke in his defence to them, he condemned in their hearing the Council [of Chalcedon] and the Tome [of Leo], and he wrote with his own hand, '[I], Peter, bishop of Alexandria, as [I have done] many times, do [also] now anathematise everything that was said and proclaimed at Chalcedon against the correct faith of our holy fathers, the 318 bishops, as well as the Tome of Leo. And I confess that these statements are my own. Whoever does not agree with them is excommunicated,²⁹ whether bishop, priest, deacon, monk, or layperson. And if ever I (or anyone else) were to write and agree to the [statements] of the council and of the Tome, then I would be one who rejects³⁰ the Holy Trinity.³¹ Yet the monks did not want to accept [Peter of Alexandria's confession of faith], saying that Peter was in communion with

1909, 409 no.160, *PLRE* ii, Theodorus 32, Stein 1949, 36 n.1, Blaudeau 2006a, 227. They are generally said to have arrived in Alexandria in March 487, but Neugebauer and van Hoesen 1959, 148–9, argue that the horoscope of Palchus referring to Theodore refers to 17 March 486, not 487. It appears from the horoscope that Theodore's tenure began well but that he was soon dismissed for corruption.

26 Location uncertain, but clearly outside the city of Alexandria itself.

27 As Moeller 1944–5, 84, notes, it was generally the case that the monks were the most refractory of the patriarch's flock. Haas 1997, 260, suggests that Peter may have had particular difficulty in bringing them into line because, unlike his predecessor Timothy Aelurus, he had no monastic background himself; see further Watts 2010, 243–4. The figure given is generally accepted and is found also in Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 101; Maspero 1923, 55, offers further figures for comparison, including cases of monasteries of 3000 and 5000 monks, and suggests that by the early seventh century there were as many as 500,000 monks in Egypt. Wipszycka 1996, 311, thinks the figure inflated, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 228, noting that there were not 200 monasteries in the vicinity who could have had abbots.

28 See nn.8–11 above on these individuals. Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 38 (p.89) provides a similar list, although they are said to have gone on a mission to Constantinople at Zeno's request, cf. Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 78, where he associates the archimandrite John, bishop of Sebennytyos, Theodore (of Antinoë) and Peter the Iberian. See further PZ vi.4c and n.51 below.

29 Syr. *nukraya*, 'foreign.'

30 Syr. *barraya*, 'one who is outside of, foreign to'.

31 Cf. Lib. *Brev.* 17/122 with n.22 above; see also Moeller 1944–5, 85–6, Stein 1949, 36, Frend 1972, 176.

those bishops who did not condemn expressly the council and the Tome as he [had anathematised them]. Peter said, ‘I have associated with these [bishops] because they have accepted the *Henoticon* of the Emperor, which nullified everything that had been done by way of addition, in every place, outside of the three holy councils; I mean Nicaea, Ephesus, and Constantinople. In my public address I explained the *Henoticon*, and demonstrated to you that it nullified the Council of Chalcedon, while [the *Henoticon*] accepted the Twelve Chapters of the blessed Cyril, and anathematised Nestorius and Eutyches, and whoever says “two natures³² in Christ,” and [whoever] assigns the miracles to one [nature] and the sufferings to the other [nature], and separates the *hypostaseis*³³ into properties and by operation.’³⁴

c. When these events had taken place, [6] only a few of the monks joined with Peter [of Alexandria], while the rest submitted a written accusation³⁵ against him to Cosmas. And they took their monasteries [away from Peter’s authority] and resided in them. Gathering together among themselves, they wanted to install a bishop instead of Peter [of Alexandria], but bishop Theodore prevented them, because he was a disciplined man, saying, ‘[Such a thing] is not right in the case of a man who believes as we [do] and who has anathematised the Council [of Chalcedon] and the Tome [of Leo], even if he associates with those who accepted the *Henoticon* and put their signature on it. Otherwise we may be blamed for rejecting him and be considered undisciplined.’ They say that Theodore did this because he was one of those bishops who had laid hands on Peter.³⁶ Then the people, having accepted Peter without dispute because he had anathematised the Council, became exceedingly agitated against the monks, but they were held in check by the leaders and Peter, so that no riot took place.³⁷

32 Syr. *kyanê*.

33 Syr. *qnumê*.

34 See v.7e above on Peter’s insistence on these points even as he presented the *Henoticon*. As Moeller 1944–5, 86, points out (cf. n.22 above), it was Peter’s association with patriarchs who had not, like him, abjured Chalcedon, that was unacceptable to these ‘schismatic Miaphysites’ (Moeller’s term).

35 *Libellus*.

36 On this decision not to elect a leader see Frend 1972, 180, 187; they were thus known as ‘Akephaloi’ or ‘headless’. Lib. *Brev.* 17/126 mentions the appointment subsequently in Palestine of a certain Isaiah as bishop, who was then sent to Alexandria but not accepted. See Blaudeau 2006a, 228 n.749, 237 n.803, on the subsequent history of these hard-line opponents of Peter, a movement which lasted until the early seventh century.

37 Zach. thus makes it clear that there was no united front against Peter: he enjoyed the support of the urban population, even if the majority of monks was opposed to him. In *Vit. Sev.* 101 Zach. specifies that it was the circus partisans in particular who were behind Peter.

a. Chapter Three recounts that when Cosmas returned to the emperor he crossed through Palestine to take with him Peter the Iberian and Isaiah the monk, because of the emperor's command.

When Cosmas returned, he crossed through Palestine and sought for the illustrious Peter and the ascetic monk Isaiah. He was not able to find Peter, who had departed ahead him, having been previously aware [of Cosmas' arrival]. Isaiah entreated God that illness might come upon him, lest on going up to the royal city he would appear to flatter the rich people, and [so] it happened to him.³⁸

b. When Cosmas reached him and gave him the emperor's letter, he showed him his sickness and his weakness and said to him, 'I, a sick man, cannot with my strength embark and travel over³⁹ the sea, lest at once [7] I should die, and were I not to appear [before] the emperor, you would be censured by both God and emperor because you brought a corpse around the world.' Thus he was able to escape. Immediately he was healed, and continued in his habitual practices of his struggle all the days of his life. This man, a seer, was equal in his name and in his actions, as we might say, to the prophet Isaiah.⁴⁰

a. Chapter Four tells of Arsenius, who was sent by the emperor as prefect to Alexandria when [the emperor] learned from Cosmas about the monks who had separated on account of what [the emperor] had commanded.⁴¹

When the *spatharius* Cosmas arrived before the emperor and gave a

See Schwartz 1934, 200 and n.1, Frend 1973, 264, Haas 1993, 315–16, Blaudeau 2006a, 228 and n.746. Had the monks therefore entered the city, the confrontations could have become extremely bloody. Note also the criticisms of Severus of those who condemned the *Henoticon*, *Sel. Lett.*, ep.v.11 (372–3/330) with Steppa 2005, 49–50.

38 See v.9b on the terms and the people mentioned here. On Cosmas' mission, see *PLRE* ii, Cosmas 3 and n.24 above. It is likewise described in *V. Petr. Iber.* 139–4/103–4 and in *V. Isa.* 13–15/9–10, where he adds that Theodore of Antinoë was also summoned and initially accepted (to go), but later went into hiding. Cf. also Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 27 (p.68). For a detailed assessment of their refusal to be implicated in the *Henoticon* see Horn 2006, 165–7, Blaudeau 2006a, 229 n.750.

39 Lit. 'sit on'.

40 A very similar account is given in *V. Isa.* 14–15/9–10, cf. Lang 1951, 162–3, on the Georgian *Life* of Peter the Iberian, a detail that is likely to go back to Zach., cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 578 n.449. Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 78 also likens Isaiah to the prophet Isaiah.

41 See *PLRE* ii, Arsenius 2, who was given both military and civilian powers in an effort to stabilise the situation: he was thus *praefectus augustalis* and *dux* simultaneously. Cf. *V. Isa.* 9/14 for an allusion to his combined powers. He replaced the previous *augustalis* Theodore, attested in Egypt in 486, on whom see n.25 above.

written reply and informed him about what had happened in Alexandria, and about the monks who had separated and the abbots and bishops who were with them, [the emperor] sent the prefect Arsenius there, having given him authority over the Roman [soldiers]. He commanded that bishops Theodore and John, the priests Agathon,⁴² Julian, and John, the deacons Helladius and Serapion, the abbots Paul and Andrew, and the rest, be called by bishop Peter of Alexandria once and twice to agreement concerning the sense⁴³ of the credal statement that was in the *Henoticon*; whoever was unwilling to be in agreement with him and be united to him should be driven out from their monasteries.

b. When Arsenius arrived [in Alexandria], Nephalius, the agitator of the people, again accompanied him. He assembled the bishops, priests, and abbots and showed them and read out in their hearing the order of the emperor. Peter again instructed them without hesitation and condemned [the council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo], exhorting them to be in agreement, but they did not accept or assent to this. Bishop Theodore said to him, 'If you make a written statement, refusing to associate with the rest [8] of the chief priests and sign it, then we will associate with you.' Peter then made the same defence, [saying], 'I am rightly in communion with those who accepted the *Henoticon* because it teaches the true faith.'⁴⁴

c. Then these men were compelled by Arsenius to go to the emperor and petition him in person concerning what should [be done] in their opinion so that the command of the emperor would be carried out. They all went, with the exception of Theodore, who absented himself. When they appeared before the emperor he was astonished by their chastity and their eloquence, although he did nothing in line with their wishes of him.⁴⁵

42 Hitherto not mentioned; not otherwise known. On the others named see vi.1a.

43 Syr. *ḥayla*, 'force, strength'.

44 As Moeller 1944–5, 87, points out, their objective was the breaking of contact between Peter and the other less anti-Chalcedonian patriarchs. When his threats against Euphemius became known (reported just below), the hard-liners realised their mission to Constantinople was no longer necessary.

45 Cf. Evagr. iii.22 and Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 38 (p.89), the latter recounting a mission undertaken by John, bishop of Sebennytyos, the priest Julian, Andrew, Paul and Theodore, the last presumably not Theodore of Antinoë, who Zach. claims did not participate. See Moeller 1944–5, 87, Stein 1949, 36, Blaudeau 2006a, 230. Despite Lebon 1909, 33 n.4, it is clear that these emissaries to Zeno were hard-line Miaphysites who opposed Peter's contact with any patriarchs who had failed to condemn Chalcedon. Evagr. iii.22 relates the same events, noting also Zeno's refusal to condemn Chalcedon: the aim of the *Henoticon*, after all, was precisely to get around the issue of Chalcedon. Cf. Lib. *Brev.* 18/127, describing the same problem being faced by Anastasius at the start of his reign. Lebon, *loc. cit.*, was led astray in his interpretation

d. While they were there, Acacius the bishop of Constantinople died, and after him Fravitta [became bishop], a humble and faithful man.⁴⁶ He wrote a canonical letter and sent it through the clergy to Peter of Alexandria, and he accepted it gladly, and Peter also wrote a letter in reply, and expressly condemned the council and the Tome of Leo.⁴⁷ Before the letter arrived, Fravitta had died, and Euphemius, who was from Apamea, and who was educated in Alexandria, became [bishop] after him; however he was crippled with the heresy of Nestorius.⁴⁸ When [Euphemius] received the letter he became angry, and became wrathful also with the clergy who carried [the letter], and he laid blame on the priest Longinus and the deacon Andrew who [tried] to convince [him], demonstrating to him the zeal of the people of Alexandria.⁴⁹ Euphemius separated from association with Peter, and, seeking to depose Peter, wanted to convene a separate synod for [that purpose]. However, Archelaus the bishop of Caesarea, a man of wonderful

of Evagrius because he adopted an alternative reading, which led him to suppose that Zeno was utterly opposed to Chalcedon: see Moeller 1944–5, 90–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 230 n.754.

Lib. *Brev.* 17/126 reports the expulsion of Chalcedonians from their cities by Peter, which triggered a mission to Zeno to complain. ‘But the emperor scandalised equally those who were of the party of the abbot Nephalius and the followers of John, the bishop and abbot of the Diolcos monastery (on whom see n.6 above), and, acting against him, removed from him the office of prior and gave it to the monastery of the abbot Amun’ (tr. after Moeller 1944–5, 96–7). This passage is hard to interpret and to place chronologically, since Zach. does not refer to a Chalcedonian mission to Constantinople. It appears, however, that Nephalius was not so influential as Zach. indicates here and suffered a setback. On Amun see PZ v n.10 above: he was a moderate Miaphysite, apparently satisfied with Peter’s anathematisation of Chalcedon, cf. Moeller 1944–5, 97 n.2, citing Lib. *Brev.* 17/122.

46 Patriarch, December 489–March 490; on his election see Blaudeau 2006a, 231–3, suggesting that, as he was attached to the church of St Thecla – a saint particularly prized by Zeno – at Sykae, he may (given his obviously Germanic name) have played a part in negotiations with Theoderic the Amal before he departed to Italy in 488, and thus come to enjoy the emperor’s favour. Acacius died on 26 November 489, see Schwartz 1934, 211, Stein 1949, 37. See Grillmeier ii.1, 298–9/263–4 on Fravitta’s exchange of letters with Peter Mongus, noting the differences between them.

47 Fravitta’s letter (below vi.5) is Schwartz 1934, 166, document 67, Grumel 1972, no.174, *CPG* 5996 = 9148. Peter’s (vi.6) is Schwartz 1934, 166, document 72, *CPG* 5496 = 9145. See Blaudeau 2006a, 233–4 with Theoph. 133.7–11, who accuses the patriarch of deceiving both Felix and Peter Mongus, pretending to each of them that he is not in communion with the other.

48 Patriarch, 490–496, a staunch upholder of Chalcedon, on whom see further PZ vii.1b with Frend 1972, 191, Grillmeier ii.1, 299–301/264–6, Blaudeau 2006a, 235, Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 227–30. According to Th. Lect. 440, he immediately struck Peter’s name from the diptychs; he also clashed with Anastasius, who was preaching anti-Chalcedonian doctrines, before he ascended the throne, Th. Lect. 441 and frg.33.

49 Longinus and Andrew are not otherwise known, save for further mentions at vi.5d and 6c.

learning, prevented him, saying, 'It is impossible that [9] the great bishop of Alexandria could be removed and expelled by a synod of one province; only a general assembly can do so.'⁵⁰

e. When Peter heard [of this] he too made threats against Euphemius, [saying] that just as the blessed Cyril had exiled Nestorius to Oasis, he would remove him likewise from his see. However, Peter then departed from the world.⁵¹ His letter that appeared in Constantinople caused many to realise that he was a believing man. When the Alexandrians John, Julian, and their associates, and the rest of those who had separated who were present there, saw his letter [addressed] to Fravitta, they changed [their minds], and they were to be united with him when they reached Alexandria.⁵²

f. [Peter Mongus] fell asleep as the men were returning, and after him Athanasius became [bishop]. He was an eloquent and believing man, and peace-loving. As he wanted eagerly to unite with the church the monks who had separated, while speaking to the people he made mention of the names of Dioscorus and Timothy in the course of his address, but omitted Peter's name in order to test the people, who because of this became extremely agitated until [Athanasius] also made mention of [Peter's] name in his speech.⁵³

50 Zach. perhaps refers to the home synod of Constantinople, the *synodos endêmousa*, so Schwartz 1934, 213, on which see Blaudeau 2006a, 410–16. Blaudeau suggests, cf. Hajjar 1969, 44–51, that the patriarch may rather have hoped to rely on canons 9 and 17 of Chalcedon, which made the see of Constantinople the ecclesiastical court of appeal for the empire, although in this case a formal accusation would have had to have been made against Peter. The canons did not envisage an action by one patriarch against another, however, and thus Archelaus' objection was justified. See Dagron 1974, 476–8 and Blaudeau 2006a, 236 n.797. Archelaus cannot be identified with the author of a work against the Messalians, so rightly Blaudeau 2006a, 236 n.798 against AK 335. Evagr. iii.22 offers a summary of this section of Zach., merely noting the letters' existence rather than quoting them.

51 Peter died on 29 October 490, see Schwartz 1934, 213.

52 Zach. *Vit. Sev.* 101–2 relates that Nephalius declared himself content with Peter's letter to Fravitta, condemning Chalcedon, which led to a breach between Euphemius and Peter (see below); he even moderated his stance, regretting his early sedition, cf. Moeller 1944–5, 101. In due course he became a defender of Chalcedon. The priest Julian also came into communication with Peter: see Sev., *Sel. Lett.*, ep.v.11 (372–3/330) with Blaudeau 2006a, 235. See also Watts 2010, 246–7.

53 Zach.'s own preference for the moderate Miaphysites is again apparent. Athanasius (II) was patriarch from 490 to 17 September 497, see Stein 1949, 161 n.2 and Blaudeau 2006a, 236 (or, less plausibly, from 489 to 17 October 496, so Grillmeier ii.4, 90/88). Athanasius immediately entered into communion with the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch and Jerusalem (cf. Evagr. iii.31), but his initiative led to further strife because he then kept Peter Mongus' name on the diptychs; evidently his hesitation in invoking his predecessor was short-

a. Chapter Five of the Sixth Book recounts the letter of Fravitta of Constantinople to Peter of Alexandria, which was as follows.⁵⁴ ‘To our holy and God-loving father and fellow minister Peter, from Fravitta, greetings in our Lord. When I weigh the weakness of my stature and marvel at the deeds that have happened to me through the mercy of God, I truly come to understand that the words [10] “He raises up the poor man from the dung heap to seat him with the leaders of his people”⁵⁵ are applicable to me. Of this mercy of God it is known that we are made worthy of it not through actions but by the grace of God that dawns from time to time upon the sons of the church through the love of the Father, and that it is not [from among] the wise, or the learned, or the eloquent of this world⁵⁶ that [grace] chooses leaders by election.

b. Before the Law,⁵⁷ Abel, who was illiterate, was pleasing to God, as were the rest of the righteous patriarchs after him. Under the Law, Grace selected men [who were] shepherds and herdsmen, and gatherers of sycamore fruit⁵⁸, and [from them] raised up prophets. After the Law, [Grace] appointed fishermen and a tent-maker⁵⁹ [to be] preachers of the living words from heaven, so that the strength of God might be truly known because it would be made known and accomplished through those who were weak.⁶⁰ The mysteries of the Christians who held fast to the incarnation of the Messiah are similar, as he says in the Gospel: “I thank you, my Father, the Lord of

lived and may have been due to his uncertainty as to how he was perceived by his flock. Leontius, *De sectis*, Actio 5, PG 86.1229B, notes that the Akephaloi (i.e. the hard-liners) refused to communicate with Athanasius because of his acceptance of Peter. He did not go as far as Peter, moreover, in demanding from his correspondents a denunciation of Chalcedon, see Blaudeau 2006a, 236 and n.801 with Perrone 1980, 142–3 n.2. After Athanasius’ circular, both Chalcedonians and hard-line Miaphysites sent delegations to Constantinople, where they debated the issues before the Emperor Anastasius (on the throne since April 491). See Lib. *Brev.* 18/127 with Schwartz 1934, 213–14. Athanasius built up good relations with Palladius of Antioch and Sallust of Jerusalem, on which see Grillmeier ii.4, 40–1/40–1 and see vii.1 below. See also Frend 1972, 198–9, on a brief thawing of relations with Rome in 497.

⁵⁴ See n.47 above on the letter.

⁵⁵ Psalm 112(113).7–8.

⁵⁶ Cf. 1 Corinthians 1.19–20.

⁵⁷ I.e. the law given to Moses in the Old Testament, superseded by Christ’s ministry, cf. Galatians 3.1–25.

⁵⁸ Cf. Amos 7.14 [Peshitta and LXX] on Amos himself. On Abel, son of Adam, see Genesis 4.1–8.

⁵⁹ Gk. *lôrarios*, Syr. *lolara*, ‘a maker of rough cloth for tents or horsecloths’, Payne Smith 1903, 238. The word can thus often be translated as ‘saddler’, while Acts 18.3 (alluded to here, describing St Paul’s profession) refers to ‘tentmakers’, cf. AK 335.

⁶⁰ 2 Corinthians 12.9.

heaven and earth, who hid these things from the wise and the learned, but revealed them to children, indeed, my Father, because such was your will.”⁶¹

c. For the foundation and the cornerstone of the holy church is Jesus the Messiah, our God, and therefore these [acts of] mercy that have been [done] to us are not unusual. [Rather, we hope]⁶² that from [these acts] we will comprehend his equal mercy toward the rest of humanity, and that we shall be manifested towards them as kind and gentle, because they are our brothers in flesh and in the faith, as well as towards the priests who are our fellow ministers and our Christ-loving brothers. Thus should we strive to lead the holy church in every place with the same correct faith and in perfect love. With the events that are taking place, with our Lord’s help, we shall show that the rational flock is one, [11] which has been entrusted to us in every place, [the flock that is] of the great shepherd who appointed us [to be] the leaders of his flock, and that we should drive out the rapacious wolves that are the condemned heresies, especially Nestorius and Eutyches, while preaching and holding to the faith of our holy fathers, who guarded the truth and gave order to the church, and like them teaching in our day the correct faith to the people and to humanity.

d. Making use of brotherly love and concord in my salutation, I offer the pledge of my friendship to Your Piety through the priest Longinus and the deacon Andrew, and as I complete what is right, I send my greetings to all of the shepherds and pure priests of your authority, and to the chaste monks and the believing people, and we also beseech Your Holiness to pray with us, that we be seen [as] wise leaders in [all] affairs, like Solomon and like Paul, Peter, and the rest of the Apostles, in preaching the truth to the children of the church, and that in everything that you might send to us, according to [our] strength may we help with what is fitting for the rest of the churches, and also with the developments occurring in the Christ-loving city, through the stability of the serene Christ-loving emperor, who is vigilant, and who strives and desires the peace of the churches, and the concord of the priests, and the unity of the people. I and those who are with me greet Your Chastity and the brotherhood that is with you.’

a. Chapter Six of Book Six recounts the letter of bishop Peter of Alexandria, which he wrote in response to Fravitta of Constantinople, [which is] as [follows].⁶³ ‘To my pious and God-loving brother and fellow minister, my

61 Matthew 11.25–6, Luke 10.21.

62 The text here is obscure and the translation offered here is a tentative one.

63 See n.47 above on the letter.

lord Fravitta, from Peter, greetings in our Lord. Now with the election [12] of Your Eminence it is time to say, “May the heavens above rejoice, and may the entire earth be glad, and may it sing anew,” in the words of the prophet.⁶⁴ For our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the single only-begotten Son of God the Father, has purchased us not with silver and gold which are corruptible, but rather laid down his life for us, like a spotless lamb, and offered a sacrifice of sweet fragrance to God his Father, and he gave his body [as] a substitute for the life of every person,⁶⁵ he who is honoured by all creation, and is the equal to the Father, God the Word, became a human being without change or alteration. He remained as he was, a human being, and is in truth forever alive, the Word of his Father and of the same nature.

b. Therefore come, as though with one tongue and one mind in the faith, and with the love of Christ let us offer to him thanksgiving with the blessed Baruch and say, “This is our God, and there is no other beside him. He discovered every way of wisdom, and gave it to Jacob his servant, and to Israel his beloved, and afterwards he appeared upon the earth and went about among human beings.”⁶⁶ For there is not one who was the Son of God, [having existed] from before the times and the ages, through whom everything was established, and another who at the end of times was born in the flesh from the Birthgiver of God, as Nestorius thought. Rather he is the same, and moreover he took seed from Abraham, according to the word of the blessed Paul, and he participated in our [nature] in flesh and blood, and he was like us in everything except sin.⁶⁷ For we do not say that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ was from heaven, as the cursed Eutyches says, or that he became a human being in semblance or in fantasy, but [13] we condemn anyone who teaches such [things].⁶⁸ We confess one only-begotten Son of God the Father, who is our Lord Jesus Christ, and we know that he is God, the Word of the Father, who became a human being for our salvation, and in his divine nature he accepted the likeness of a servant⁶⁹ through the [divine] economy. This is the faith of the church of Alexandria, by which we are adorned: the God-fearing bishops, clergy, monks, and all the people of God,

64 Psalm 95(96).11, Isaiah 49.13, cf. Isaiah 44.23. An allusion perhaps to Cyril (of Alexandria), *ep.*39 (*CPG* 5339) in *ACO* i.1.4, p.15, and *ACO* ii.1.1, p.107 (ch.246, tr. in Gaddis and Price 2005, i, 178 with n.161), written to patriarch John of Antioch in April 433, which opens with the same quotation (and marks the end of a split between the two churches).

65 1 Peter 1.18, 19, Ephesians 5.2, 1 Timothy 2.6.

66 Baruch 3.36–38.

67 Cf. Hebrews 2.16–17.

68 See PZ v.4b for this insistence on rejecting Eutychianism.

69 Philippians 2.7.

who are increased more and more in the churches, and the assembly of the people that has grown, while we are obedient to the [words of] the Apostle who says, “If anyone proclaims to you other than what we have proclaimed to you, let him be condemned.”⁷⁰

c. But the cause of all of these good things that are beloved and acceptable to us was the election from above of the leadership of Your Piety and the will of the believing emperor, the Christ-loving Zeno, who has assented to your election, he who for the unanimity of the people, and for our truth, in strength and truth anathematised, in what he faithfully wrote down in the *Henoticon*, all that was opined and stated boldly at Chalcedon and in the Tome of Leo,⁷¹ and assenting to this document we preach by means of the living word and in writing to the believing peoples, just as also our holy brother and fellow minister Acacius, worthy of memory, was shown to think and to teach until [his life] was completed, while the Alexandrians testified to us his true faith,⁷² as Your Piety is aware. For it is fitting for the Christ-loving king not only to subjugate enemies and place under his feet the barbarous nations, but also to expose the deceits of the intellectual enemies, and to cause to shine forth the true faith before the believing people.⁷³ For Your Piety has sprouted forth and blossomed for us [14] like a plant of peace, and this is a gift for us from the believing emperor through the will of God, who preordained this, as I mentioned above. Therefore we are delighted by these things, because a good priest has risen and has appeared to the believing peoples. May God protect him and adorn him with crowns that are from above through his rich hand, as we confidently pray that, as he travels along the whole way of the truth, in the footsteps of the holy fathers, he may be found to be a proven and faithful priest, through the mercy of Christ our Saviour, through whom [may there be] glory to the Father, with the Holy Spirit, forever. We have lovingly accepted the bearers of the letter of Your Holiness, the excellent priest Longinus and the deacon Andrew, and we send them back with a greeting to Your Piety.’

70 Paraphrase of Galatians 1.8.

71 Clearly an over-interpretation of the *Henoticon*, which certainly does not condemn either document. See Grillmeier ii.1, 298 and n.93/264 and n.93, Blaudeau 2006a, 234 and n.786.

72 It seems doubtful whether Acacius was of the same mind as Peter as regards Chalcedon, especially given the investigation reported at vi.1b. See Stein 1949, 38, Blaudeau 2006a, 234–5. Peter perhaps alludes here to his *apocrisarii* in Constantinople, who reported to him concerning Acacius, in an effort to exert pressure on Fravitta, see Blaudeau 2006a, 324–5 with nn.329, 331.

73 Cf. Psalm 108(109).9, 1 Corinthians 15.27 with Blaudeau 2006a, 321 n.325, suggesting a parallel with Timothy Aelurus’ messianic entry into Constantinople in 475, on which see PZ v.1a.

d. Athanasius wrote in the same manner two years later to Palladius, who succeeded Peter [the Fuller] in Antioch. He wrote expressly anathematising the Council [of Chalcedon], making use of boldness of speech [beyond] the writing of the *Henoticon*.⁷⁴ John, who was [bishop] after Athanasius, wrote to whomever asked him, anathematising the council and the Tome, and would give [his letter] with cheer and without fear.⁷⁵ And Flavian, who became [bishop] after Palladius in Antioch, sent the priest Solomon⁷⁶ of his church to this John of Alexandria. [Solomon] asked for a letter from him [addressed] to Flavian concerning the agreement in faith. [John] did not undertake to do this until he had received from him [Solomon] a written oath that he would send to him a letter from Flavian, in which he anathematises the council and the Tome. John, his namesake and successor, thought and acted in the same manner.⁷⁷

e. After Zeno had reigned seventeen years, and such [things] as these had taken place in the churches [15] in his empire, and the tyrants Basiliscus and Marcus had risen against him, and had been expelled as has been written

74 Palladius was patriarch from 488 to 498. According to Th. Lect. frg.51, cf. Cyr. Scyth. V. Sab. 50 (p.140), he anathematised Chalcedon to please Anastasius, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 231 n.759. PZ vii.1b claims that Athanasius openly condemned council and Tome, an assertion accepted by (e.g.) Frend 1972, 193, although Schwartz 1934, 214, dismisses PZ's account (as opposed to Zach.'s); whether what is written here is the work of Zach. or PZ is uncertain. It seems more likely, however, that PZ at vii.1 is deriving his information from here rather than that this element is an insertion here by PZ.

75 John II Hemula (the mule, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 360 n.469 on the epithet), patriarch of Alexandria from 496 to 29 April 505. PZ's insistence on the genuine anti-Chalcedonianism of these two patriarchs (as well as Peter Mongus) contrasts with Severus' criticism of all three for communicating with those who had not condemned Chalcedon and the Tome in *Sel. Lett.*, ep.iv.2 (288/255), cf. Grillmeier ii.4, 44/44–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 313. Severus refers in passing to copies of the letters of all three patriarchs to their peers that were still available to be consulted in Constantinople. Blaudeau 2006a, 562 n.366, suggests that this information (also in Evagr. iii.23) comes from a subsequent addition to Zach. designed to clear Athanasius and John of any accusation of weakening in their opposition to Chalcedon.

76 Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* 22 (p.48) mentions an Armenian priest of Antioch, Solomon, who, like John himself, had been the *syncellus* of Peter the Fuller, and who was sent with a certain Peter of Titopolis with Peter the Fuller's letter to Martyrius of Jerusalem. It seems likely therefore that this is the same individual, cf. PZ v.10b, n.148.

77 Such an intransigent line seems unlikely for John Hemula, as Severus' criticisms (see n.75) imply. John III (of Nikiu/Nicaïotes), on the other hand, patriarch from 505 to 22 May 516, was more outspokenly anti-Chalcedonian: Severus praises him for demanding an explicit condemnation of Chalcedon from patriarch Timothy of Constantinople (511–518). See Stein 1949, 161 n.2, Grillmeier ii.4, 41/41, Blaudeau 2006a, 313.

above, and Illus, Leontius and Euprepus⁷⁸ had rebelled against him and were killed in the East, and moreover a man [by the name of] Theoderic the tyrant had captured Thrace and other places, and went to Rome and subjugated it because Odoacer who was the Anticaesar⁷⁹ in [the city] had fled from there to the city of Ravenna in Italy, Zeno died in the year 802 in the reckoning of the Greeks.⁸⁰ Anastasius [began to] reign after him on Wednesday in Great Week, when Euphemius was bishop of Constantinople, and Flavian [was bishop] in Antioch, and Athanasius [was bishop] in Alexandria, and Sallust [was bishop] in Jerusalem [having succeeded] Martyrius, and Felix [was bishop] in Rome after Simplicius.⁸¹

a. Chapter Seven lists the chief priests in Zeno's time.⁸² The chief priests in Zeno's time were these. In Rome, following Hilary [was] Simplicius, to whom Zeno wrote concerning John the Liar, who was expelled from Alexandria.⁸³ Following him [was] Felix, the [bishop] when the reign of Anastasius commenced.⁸⁴ In Alexandria, Timothy the Great [was bishop],

78 Euprepus refers of course to Pamprepius, as at v.6f. It should be noted that the Syriac form for Illus' name is different here from v.6f: there it is *ywlys*, whereas here it is *'lws*. It is likely therefore that PZ is here drawing on a different source.

79 The MS has 'Arcadius' for Odoacer, but it is clear that the latter is meant. On the term Anticaesar, meaning 'deputy', see PZ vii n.211, cf. ix.1a. Here it appears that PZ (and not Zach., so rightly Goltz 2008, 548) is drawing on a source hostile to Theoderic, since it is his adversary, Odoacer, who is qualified by the term Anticaesar (later applied to Justinian). For discussion of this passage see Chrysos 1986, 73, Prostko-Prostyński 1994, 134, Goltz 2008, 545–7, Goltz 2009, 183–7, Lange 2010. Despite what PZ affirms, there is no evidence that Theoderic went to Rome at this point, cf. PZ x n.153.

80 AG 802 = A.D. 490/1: Zeno died on 9 April 491, see (e.g.) Schwartz 1934, 216, Blaudeau 2006a, 239. The secular events alluded to are mostly reported in book v, although Theoderic and his invasion of Italy receives no mention there. Theoderic left Thrace in 488; after two initial defeats, Odoacer withdrew to Ravenna, where he was besieged and finally killed by Theoderic in 493. On these events see Stein 1949, 39–58, Heather 1991, 294–308, Moorhead 1992, 19–27.

81 Anastasius ascended the throne on Maundy Thursday, 11 April 491: see Haarer 2006, 1–6. Hence Palladius was still patriarch of Antioch at this time (n.74 above), not Flavian, cf. Kugener 1900b, 464, Blaudeau 2006a, 562 n.364, suggesting that a scribal error is at fault here.

82 For a tabulation of these patriarchs see appendix 2. The last mentioned event is the expulsion of Flavian of Antioch, which took place in 512, which implies that the compiler of this list must have written after this date.

83 A reference to Simplicius, *ep.* 19 in Schwartz 1934, 3, i.e. document 41 (p.164), cf. 200, dating to July 482. The letter, at any rate what remains of it, concentrates on vilifying Peter Mongus rather than John Talaia.

84 Simplicius died in March 483 and was succeeded by Felix (III/II). He in turn died in March 492, to be succeeded by Gelasius.

who was recalled from exile, and Timothy Wobblecap, and John who was expelled immediately, and Peter, and after him, Athanasius. In Jerusalem [there was] Anastasius, [then] Martyrius, and then Sallust.⁸⁵ In Antioch [there was] Martyrius, who was expelled, and Julian, and Stephen, then the other Stephen, and the believing Peter, and Calendion who was expelled, and Palladius, and following him Flavian, the one who was expelled in the time of Anastasius.⁸⁶ [16] In Constantinople, after Gennadius [was] Acacius, and following him Fravitta, and after him Euphemius, the one who was expelled in the time of Anastasius.⁸⁷

b. Only the span of the seventeen years of the life of Autocrator Zeno is in this sixth book and in the fifth book that preceded it, which were translated in a flowing style and with abridgements, in brevity of words for the edification of the Syriac reader from the Greek chronicle of Zachariah Rhetor, which he composed thus far in expansive speech, as is typical of the broad style of the Greeks.

85 On whom see PZ v.5b, v.6a, vi.6e respectively.

86 On the patriarchs up to Peter (the Fuller) see PZ iv.12mm and n.211. On Calendion see PZ v.5b and n.83; PZ vi.6d above on Palladius. On Flavian's expulsion see PZ vii below with Haarer 2006, 151–5. A similar list may be found in PD ii, 2/2 (see Introduction C [3][iii]).

87 Narrated below at vii.1b; the expulsion took place in 496.

BOOK SEVEN

a. [16] This seventh book containing the fifteen chapters below concerns the [events] that took place during the reign of Emperor Anastasius. The first chapter concerns the beginning of his reign and how bishop Euphemius was deposed. The second chapter concerns the Isaurians who rebelled, and their leaders the tyrants who were captured and killed. The third chapter concerns the cities Theodosiopolis and Amida that were captured. The fourth chapter [relates] how the city of Amida was captured. The fifth chapter is about the famine that arose [in Amida] and how the Persians departed from there. The sixth chapter is about how the city of Dara was built up. The seventh chapter concerns the departure of Macedonius who was driven out from Constantinople. The eighth chapter is the letter of Simeon the priest that presents information concerning [Macedonius'] departure. The ninth chapter concerns Timothy who succeeded him and how 'and was crucified [17] for us' was proclaimed during his time in Constantinople. The tenth chapter concerns the council that took place in Sidon during [the episcopacy] of the bishops Flavian and Philoxenus, in the fifth year, that is, in the year 823 of the Greeks. The eleventh chapter concerns the petition from the monks of the East and Cosmas the Antiochene that was presented to the council. The twelfth chapter concerns the council which took place in Tyre during the time of Severus and Philoxenus, which with great boldness of speech condemned the assembly of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. The thirteenth chapter concerns Empress Ariadne who died and the tyrant Vitalian, who seized Hypatius in battle. The fourteenth chapter concerns Timothy who died and John who succeeded him, and the demons who possessed¹ individuals in Egypt, Alexandria, and the 'Arab,'² and who came to the feast of the dedication in Jerusalem, barked at the cross, and then departed. The fifteenth chapter concerns those archbishops in the time of Emperor Anastasius. Then Anastasius died in the year 829 of the Greeks, in the 324th Olympiad.³

1 Lit. 'who were put on.'

2 On this region see n.22 below.

3 AG 829 is A.D. 517/18; the Olympiad date is correct. Cf. PZ iii.12b for another dating in

a. The first chapter of the seventh book recounts the reign of the Emperor⁴ Anastasius who reigned after Zeno and concerning bishop Euphemius of [Constantinople] who was deposed.

When⁵ Zeno had reigned seventeen years, as was written above in the sixth book and the chapters it contains, he died in the 317th Olympiad, [18] in the year 802 of the Greek era, in the fourteenth indiction on Wednesday of Holy Week.⁶ Then Anastasius, who had been a *silentarius* decurion, became emperor. This man had come from the city of Dyrrhachium; he had a warrior's appearance, was sound of soul, and a believer.⁷ While he was a soldier he had close contact with Empress Ariadne who desired and agreed to his becoming emperor.⁸ A few days before he became emperor, this event happened. There was a man whose name was John the *scholasticus* from Amida and the brother of Donatus.⁹ This man was righteous and pure, fearing God and turning aside from evil. He was always at the service

this format and see the Introduction C (3)(ii).

4 PZ here uses the Greek *autokratōr* rather than the usual Syriac title, *malka*, i.e. king (which we translate generally as 'emperor' in the case of Roman rulers).

5 In MS V, fol. 82^r, a fragment begins here with the title: 'Concerning the vision that appeared to John the *scholasticus* of Amida, the brother of Donatus, concerning his reign.' In our manuscript Donatus is given rather in the form Dith: see n.9 below.

6 All three dates refer to A.D. 490/1, cf. Grumel 1958, 244. Other sources, e.g. Evagr. (iii.29, derived from Eust. Epiph.) and Theoph. (136.16–20), offer further chronological indicators (e.g. dates from Adam and Diocletian), on which see Whitby 2000a, 164 n.92. PZ places Zeno's death on Wednesday 10 April; he is the only source to offer such precision. Anastasius' coronation is securely dated to the following day. The detailed account offered by *De Cer.* i.92, 417D, implies, however, that Zeno died two days before the accession of his successor, i.e. on 9 April, and this version is generally preferred. See Stein 1949, 76 n.3, Lilie 1995, Haarer 2006, 1–6, Meier 2009, 66–75.

7 A more detailed portrait of Anastasius is given by Mal. 16.1, cf. Haarer 2006, 4–5, Meier 2009, 58–9. PZ refers to the post of decurion of the *silentarii* which Anastasius held at the time of his accession; there were three decurions and thirty *silentarii*, see Jones 1964, 571–2, Meier 2009, 61–2. As a leading palace official, he thus had many occasions on which he will have met Ariadne. See *PLRE* ii, Anastasius 4, on his origins. The reference to him as a 'believer' indicates that he was viewed by the historian as an anti-Chalcedonian; precisely because this was the perception of Anastasius at the time, Euphemius, patriarch of Constantinople, obliged him to sign a document at his accession, acknowledging Chalcedon as the definition of orthodoxy. See Evagr. iii.32, Stein 1949, 77, Grillmeier ii.1, 299–300/264–5, Meier 2009, 61, 74.

8 Lilie 1995, 3–5, argues, however, that the members of the court chose Anastasius and merely ascribed the choice to the empress, cf. Haarer 2006, 4–5 (accepting Ariadne's role). The Syriac term for 'close contact' is the Greek word *parrhêsia*, a common term in Syriac (used, e.g., at PZ vii.2a, on the Isaurians' influence over Zeno) and unlikely to imply any sort of affair.

9 So MS V; PZV, ii, 12, reads 'Dith'; cf. n.5 above.

of the church, willingly and freely, as the *scholasticus*.¹⁰ While he was in Constantinople on a mission on behalf of his city, once and a second time he saw a vision that Anastasius the *silentarius* was going to become emperor. He called to him and said, 'In accordance with the uprightness, virtues, and character of your soul, be peaceful, tranquil, humble and pure so that you accomplish the good will of God, and show yourself to everyone as calm and pleasant, an asset to everyone who belongs to your lineage. I do not stand in need of you nor do I try to flatter you when I reveal to you that you will soon become emperor.'¹¹ Since this John was renowned and honoured because of his qualities, was known to many, and because he was also a skilled speaker, Anastasius believed him and was convinced, and he was always there with him at vigil [19] in the church. It then happened that after he had become emperor he wanted to bestow on his friend gifts of gratitude from among the things that are desirable and visible to people, but this John did not accept anything at all from him, and instead he immediately left the city and returned to his country; [what was provided] in the documents that Zeno made for him was sufficient; he only took from Anastasius the assurance that they would be received.¹²

b. Bishop Euphemius of [Constantinople] was threatening Peter of Alexandria that he would bring about his deposition because he had written a reply to Fravitta who preceded Euphemius and explicitly condemned the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo in his synodical letter that was sent through the clerics Longinus the priest and the deacon Andrew. Yet at that time Euphemius was prevented from doing this on the advice of bishop Archelaus of Caesarea, a prudent man who was present there.¹³ Because Peter had died, Euphemius had the same grudge against Athanasius who became bishop after him in Alexandria. [Athanasius] had more openly and more authoritatively condemned the council and the Tome, and Euphemius

10 *PLRE* ii, Ioannes 39, suggests that John may have been an ecclesiastical advocate (in the church courts).

11 PZ's anecdote about John the brother of Donatus is unparalleled in any other source. The fact that John came from Amida makes it likely that PZ was drawing on local sources here. Such predictions of ascending the throne were not unusual, cf. e.g. Vasiliev 1950, 88 (for Justin I) and Weber 2000, 174–5, more generally.

12 The reference is obscure; PZ uses the Greek term *khartai* for documents. It may refer to documents to do with Amida, e.g. privileges accorded by Zeno. It may alternatively refer to the *Henoticon*, in which case PZ is reporting that John was satisfied by Anastasius' loyalty to the anti-Chalcedonian cause.

13 PZ here abbreviates vi.4d.

plotted against him to remove him.¹⁴ He called to his aid Felix [the bishop] of Rome,¹⁵ and when his cunning was made known to Athanasius through his *apocrisarii* who were there, who wrote and sent to him also a copy of the letter from him [addressed] to Felix, Athanasius planned and wrote to Sallust of Jerusalem and received from him a reply of agreement on [matters of] faith.¹⁶ Then the two of them informed on Euphemius to the Emperor Anastasius [revealing] that he was a heretic and they showed and authenticated [20] the copy of his letter. When his actions were examined by certain bishops who happened to be in Constantinople, and also by believing monks who were from Alexandria and the East, he was removed and ejected from his see. In his place Macedonius [became] bishop, who was also removed after fifteen years as is written below.¹⁷

a. The second chapter of the seventh [book] informs us concerning Isauria, which rebelled.

The Isaurians were prosperous in the time of Zeno, who fled before the tyrants Basiliscus and Marcus and dwelled while taking refuge in the fortresses there, which were called Salmon.¹⁸ They also had influence in

14 See PZ vi.6d on Athanasius (II) with nn.53 and 74. The events related here are spread over some years. Peter Mongus died in October 490, before Anastasius' elevation, as did Fravitta, whom Euphemius succeeded in March 490. See Stein 1949, 38–9, Grillmeier ii.1, 298–9/263–4, PZ vi n.53.

15 Theoph. 135.17–20 (Th. Lect. 442, cf. *KG* 34) and *Syn. Vet.* 108 confirm the contact between Euphemius and Felix (before Anastasius' accession), although according to Theoph. the pope refused to acknowledge Euphemius as patriarch because he had failed to remove the names of Acacius and others from the diptychs. See Blaudeau 2006a, 236–9, who, following Schwarz 1934, 214, casts doubt on PZ's account of an attempted collusion between Euphemius and the pope, cf. Haarer 2006, 127, Meier 2009, 88. PZ passes over the local synod organised by Euphemius in 492 which confirmed Chalcedon as the touchstone of orthodoxy, on which see Th. Lect. *KG* 41, Grillmeier ii.1, 300/265 and n.99, Haarer 2006, 136.

16 Frend 1972, 189 n.2, dates this démarche by the two patriarchs to c.494. Euphemius' downfall did not occur until 496, however, *ibid.* 200, following accusations of collaboration with Isaurian rebels: see Th. Lect. 449–50, Theoph. 139.6–13, with Charanis 1974, 56, Stein 1949, 166, 169, Grillmeier ii.4, 41/41. The alliance between the staunchly anti-Chalcedonian patriarchate of Alexandria and the increasingly Chalcedonian patriarchate of Jerusalem was a fragile one, however: see Frend 1972, 191–3, Maraval 1998b, 123–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 307.

17 Euphemius was exiled to Euchaita in Pontus, as was Macedonius in 511. The bishops in Constantinople were probably members of the *synodos endêmousa*, on which see the Glossary. On Euphemius' deposition see Haarer 2006, 137, Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 227–30, Meier 2009, 89–90.

18 Location unknown: see PZ v n.13. Feld 2005, 254, notes that other sources report Zeno to have fled first to Olba, then to Sbide. Basiliscus seized power in January 475, profiting from the unpopularity of the Isaurians in Constantinople and the intrigues of his sister Verina, the

the administration in the time of Zeno, who was their benefactor, and made them worthy of all manner of benefits that were from him. Because of this, they did not accept their good fortune, but became boastful and proud when Anastasius became emperor. They stirred up a rebellion against him, set up for themselves tyrants, and refused the officials that were sent to them by Anastasius. They did not submit themselves to give tribute to him but caused harm to the provinces surrounding them.¹⁹ When an outcry and accusation were brought against them to the emperor, he sent an army that came against them, and the Isaurians were defeated in battle. They showed themselves to be weak and the tyrants were captured and executed.²⁰ The world was shaken:²¹ locusts arrived in the 'Arab in Upper Mesopotamia,²² and there was a famine in the ninth²³ year, concerning which the account of the teacher

wife of the previous emperor, Leo I. He quickly raised his son Marcus to the rank of Augustus, cf. *PLRE* ii, Fl. Basiliscus 2, Bury 1923, i, 390–1, Treadgold 1997, 157, Feld 2005, 251–4. In August 476 Zeno regained power in Constantinople. See also PZ v.1, 5 (with little detail on the political aspect of the revolt, however).

19 See Elton 2000a, 299–300, Feld 2005, 276, on the benefits which accrued to the Isaurians under Zeno, cf. Joh. Ant. frg.239.4, referring to an annual subsidy of 1400 lbs. of gold; Evagr. iii.35 has 5000 lbs. Soon after Anastasius' accession, a riot in the hippodrome at Constantinople was followed by the expulsion of many leading Isaurians from the capital, including Zeno's brother Longinus, who was banished to Egypt. The privileges which they had enjoyed under Zeno were likewise terminated. Not surprisingly, several of those expelled in 491 set about fomenting a rebellion upon their return to Isauria. See Stein 1949, 82–3, Capizzi 1969, 96–7, Feld 2005, 332–3.

20 Their leaders were Longinus of Cardala (*PLRE* ii, Longinus 3), Lingis or Lilingis (*PLRE* ii, Lilingis), two men called Athenodorus (*PLRE* ii, Athenodorus 2 and 3) and a certain Conon (*PLRE* ii, Conon 4). Lingis/Lilingis was killed in battle in the first engagement in late 492, while Conon was defeated and killed near Claudopolis in the following year. After a long and difficult war, the two Athenodori and a certain Longinus of Selinus (*PLRE* ii, Longinus 4) were captured and executed in 497; the remaining Longinus was captured in 498, exhibited in Constantinople and executed at Nicaea. See Brooks 1893, 234–7, Stein 1949, 81–4, Lenski 1999, 427–9, Feld 2005, 332–5, Meier 2009, 75–84.

21 In September 499, cf. Ps.-Josh. 34 with Stein 1949, 193 n.1 and Luther 1997, 168–70. The city of Nicopolis in Armenia was destroyed by the earthquake. Another struck the Phoenician coast in August 502, cf. Ps.-Josh. 47.

22 The region of the 'Arab lay to the east of Constantia. See Dillemann 1962, 75–8, Luther 1997, 173, Greatrex 1998, 121 n.4, Trombley and Watt 2000, 37 n.180. We have translated the Syriac Bet Nahrain, the 'country of the rivers' (the Arabic Jazira) as Upper Mesopotamia.

23 The ninth indiction year runs from 1 September 500 to 31 August 501. Ps.-Josh. 38–44 offers a more detailed account of the locust plague and the famine which followed it. As he makes clear, the famine began in 500 and lasted until 502; he also (ch.38) notes the flight from the countryside to the cities. For details see Luther 1997, 173, Trombley and Watt 2000, 37–46 (notes), Telelis 2004, nos.109–12, Stathakopoulos 2004, no.80, Wiemer 2007b, 258–81.

Jacob of Batnae recounts.²⁴ In the eleventh [year] of the reign of Anastasius, many of the inhabitants of the 'Arab died both in Amida, where they had migrated, as well as in various other places.²⁵

a. [21] The third chapter of the seventh book gives information concerning Theodosiopolis in Armenia, which was captured, and concerning the city of Amida in Upper Mesopotamia.

While Peroz, the king of Persia, was ruling over his country, in the thirteenth year of Anastasius²⁶ the Huns descended from the gates that were guarded by the Persians and from the mountainous areas there and reached Persian territory.²⁷ Peroz became alarmed and assembled an army and met them. When he learned from them of the purpose of their preparation and

24 Jacob of Sarug (the Syriac name for Batnae) was, at the time of this composition (502/3, the eleventh indiction), a *periodeutês* at Batnae, as Ps.-Josh. 54 states. See Trombley and Watt 2000, 63 nn.300, 303, describing this position, similar to that of a *chôrepiskopos* (for which see glossary). Ps.-Josh., *loc.cit.*, also mentions a work by Jacob 'on the time of the locusts', doubtless the one here alluded to by PZ, but its identification remains uncertain. Trombley and Watt 2000, 63 n.303, suggest that the reference is to an unedited *memra* on the desolation of Amida in BL Add. 14,588, foll. 100^r-108^r.

25 The eleventh year of Anastasius' reign was from April 501 to April 502. PZ refers both to the natural disasters (see n.23) and to the siege of Amida, described below.

26 The thirteenth year of Anastasius' reign was from April 503 to April 504; King Peroz, however, died in 484 (see below). A comparison with Mich. Syr. ix.7 (257a/154) shows that something has probably dropped out from PZ here, since he refers to trouble between the Romans and Persians now, i.e. during Anastasius' reign, and then proceeds to explain the origins of the dispute, recounting the same details as those given here by PZ; he explicitly places the Hunnic invasion of Persian territory in the reign of Zeno, however. The reference to the thirteenth year of Anastasius, which does not occur in Mich. Syr., might yet be correct, in the context of a further Hunnic raid.

27 The Huns referred to here would most naturally be identified with the Sabirs, a people situated to the north of the Caucasus mountains (see PZ xii n.208): it was against just such invaders that the Persians had erected defences at the two main passes across the mountains, at Dariel and Derbent, the gates mentioned by PZ. Unrest and invasions troubled this north-western frontier towards the end of Peroz's reign, see Luther 1997, 121 and Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 59–60 and again in 504/5, see Greatrex 1998, 110 and n.104 The Huns who defeated Peroz, however, were known as the Hephthalites (or Abdelai, cf. PZ xii.7k[ix]). They were situated on the north-eastern frontier of Persia and proved a troublesome foe to the Sasanians from their appearance in the 460s until the mid-sixth century. See Miyakawa and Kollautz 1968, Lippold 1974, Luther 1997, 110 n.47. The precise location of Peroz's defeat is unknown, although Schippmann 1990, 44, places it at Balkh (modern Afghanistan), cf. Winter and Dignas 2007, 98. As Altheim 1960, 10, points out, the reference to the north-west region is misleading, since the passage clearly concerns the Hephthalites rather than tribes in the Caucasus. See also the next note. A translation and commentary of this passage may be found in Altheim 1960, 8–10.

their invasion of his country they said to him, 'What the kingdom of the Persians gives to us as tribute is not sufficient for us barbarians, who, like wild beasts, reject God.²⁸ We live in the north-western territory by weapons, both the bow and the sword,²⁹ and we feed on the food [of all kinds of] meat. The emperor of the Romans has promised us through his envoys to give us twice the tribute if we renounce our friendship with you Persians. Thus we have again arrived and presented ourselves: either give to us like the Romans and we will then make a treaty with you, but if you do not give to us, then receive war!'³⁰ When Peroz considered the determination of the Huns, although they were considerably smaller [in number] than his army, he decided to lie to them and receive them, so he promised to give them [what they wanted].³¹ Then four hundred men from the leaders of the Huns assembled and with them was Eustathius, a crafty merchant from Apamea with whom they took counsel.³² Peroz and with him four hundred men assembled

28 The claim attributed by PZ to the Huns, that they are not Christians, is correct, though as he notes at xii.71-o, some conversions in the Caucasus were made before the middle of the sixth century. The remainder of this boastful tirade gives the impression of a standard characterisation of a nomadic people. Whether the Hephthalites were in fact nomadic, however, is doubtful, see PZ xii n.217 and Boerm 2007, 207–8.

29 Proc. *Wars* i.7.8 refers specifically to Hephthalite archers, while Ps.-Josh. 62 mentions thongs.

30 Syr. *qabbelw graba*: precisely the same idiom is found in Ps.-Josh. 19 (p.248.28), the ultimatum issued by King Kavadh to Anastasius when the latter succeeded Zeno in 491. It is *prima facie* unlikely that the Romans, heavily involved in internal problems and in maintaining control of the Balkans in the 470s and 480s, would have been seeking to destabilise Persia by offers such as that described here by PZ, despite Hannestad 1955–7, 440–1. The version here presented seems rather to be an effort to justify Kavadh's invasion of 502, laying the blame both on the Romans and on Peroz.

Mal. 17.10 describes a comparable incident, in which, during the reign of Justin I, a Hunnic tribe under a king Zilgibi abandoned the Roman for the Persian side. Apprised of this, the emperor informed king Kavadh of their previous alliance with the Romans, whereupon the king massacred his new allies.

31 No other source gives quite the same account as PZ of the treacherous dealings of Peroz, although it is closest to that of Proc. *Wars* i.3–4: Proc. likewise stresses the craftiness of Peroz in swearing an oath, describing his resort to a subterfuge (i.3.19–22), and the importance attached by the Hephthalites to the breaking of the oath (i.4.9). Mich. Syr. ix.7 (256–7b/154–5) follows PZ's account but dates the events to Zeno's reign.

32 No other source reports contact between the Romans and the Hephthalites nor refers to this Eustathius. Proc. *Wars* i.3.8–14 mentions the presence of an ambassador called Eusebius (*PLRE* ii, Eusebius 19) among those accompanying Peroz during an unsuccessful initial campaign against the Hephthalites. Roman diplomats were active in the Caucasus at any rate in the 520s, when Justinian succeeded in concluding an alliance with a Hunnic queen, Boa, who then inflicted a heavy defeat on Hunnic allies of the Persians. See Mal. 18.31 with Stein

and went up a mountain. [22] They enacted an agreement [with the Huns]; they ate with one another and swore an oath, raising their hands to heaven.³³ A few remained with the four hundred men who were to take the objects of the tribute that would be collected, but the rest of the Huns departed and returned to their country. Ten days later, Peroz reneged and prepared for war both against the Huns who had departed and against the four hundred who remained and those with them. This Eustathius the merchant encouraged the Huns not to be alarmed, although they were considerably smaller [in number]. In the place where the oaths had taken place they cast musk and incense on the burning coals of the fire and offered it to God, as Eustathius advised them, in order that [God] would overthrow the liars. They made war with Peroz and killed him and a large [portion] of his army, scorched the land of the Persians and returned to their own country. The body of Peroz was never found and in his country they call him 'The Liar.'³⁴

b. Kavadh, who became king after him, and his nobles had a grudge against the Romans, saying that they had caused the invasion of the Huns, the pillaging, and the scorching of the country.³⁵ So Kavadh assembled an army and went out to Theodosiopolis in Roman Armenia and they took

1949, 283–4 and Greatrex 1998, 143. PZ's account is unique in making no reference to the Hephthalite king who defeated Peroz.

33 Proc. *Wars* i.4.9 refers to salt, over which Peroz swore his oath, a detail which is confirmed in other sources about Sasanian treaties, cf. Garsoïan 1989, 301 n.2, Boerm 2007, 156; he also describes how Peroz had to prostrate himself before the Hephthalite king before concluding the treaty (*Wars* i.3.17–22), cf. Theoph. 122.5–10 with Trombley and Watt 2000, 10 n.44.

34 Peroz's defeat and death occurred in 484, in July according to Sanspeur 1975–6, 142. Cf. Tabari, I, 874–7/113–16, setting forth three separate traditions, Łaz. 85 (213–15), Ps.-Josh. 11 and Proc. *Wars* i.4.1–13, 32, for the principal sources on this crushing setback for the Persians; Luther 1997, 123 n.90 offers a complete list. Greatrex 1994, 56–64, and Luther 1997, 116–24, consider the traditions in detail. All are united in pinning the blame on Peroz and his breaking of the treaty concluded with the Hephthalites: see Cameron 1969–70, 153–4, Bosworth 1999, 120 n.308. Despite this, Peroz's reputation in Persia was not so negative as PZ implies: see Cameron 1969–70, 153.

35 Kavadh's invasion was preceded by several demands for money from the Romans: as Ps.-Josh. 18–19 emphasises, the Persian treasury was empty and Kavadh needed to consolidate his position and to reward the Hephthalites, thanks to whose military backing he had regained his throne in 497/8. Anastasius proved obdurate, however, and Kavadh therefore opened hostilities with a view to seizing as much booty as he could. See Greatrex 1998, 76–8, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 60–2, Haarer 2006, 47–52. We are exceptionally well informed about this conflict since, in addition to PZ's account, we also have the rich narrative of Ps.-Josh. (tr. Trombley and Watt 2000) and the more selective version of Proc. (*Wars* i.7–9). The accounts of PZ and Proc. contain many similarities, and it is highly probable that they both relied on the same source, e.g. concerning the siege of Amida. See Trombley and Watt 2000, xxxviii, Greatrex forthcoming.

the city. He dealt mercifully with the inhabitants of the city in that they were not treated outrageously, but he led off Constantine, the leader of the city.³⁶

c. In the month³⁷ of October he arrived in Amida in Upper Mesopotamia. With frequent assaults of archers with sharp-pointed arrows, a battering ram striking on the wall so that it would collapse, and a roof of hides³⁸ to protect the siege mounds³⁹ which they assembled until they were almost level with the top of the wall, they were at war, day after day, for three months [23] but [Kavadh] did not capture the city;⁴⁰ all the while the people who were with him had much work in activity and battle, and he was hearing with his ears the insults, ridicule and mockery from disorderly men on the wall, and was reduced to great distress. He had grief and regret because winter with its severity was approaching, and because the Persians showed themselves to be weak in their flimsy clothing, and because their bows were looser in the moist air,⁴¹ and their battering rams were not able to damage the wall or breach it because [the defenders] were tying up bundles of reeds from beds with chains by [means of] which they received the blows of the battering-rams, and they prevented them from breaching the wall.⁴² However, [the

36 Theodosiopolis (Erzerum) fell to Kavadh in August 502, perhaps partly thanks to treachery on the part of the commander, Constantine. Although Ps.-Josh. 48 claims that Kavadh razed the city and deported the population, PZ's account is more credible. See Greatrex 1998, 79–80, *PLRE* ii, Constantinus 14, Meier 2009, 196. The king then moved southwards towards Amida, capturing Martyropolis on the way, see Greatrex 1998, 80–1, Haarer 2006, 53–4.

37 The siege is described in detail also by both Ps.-Josh. 50, 53 and Proc. *Wars* i.7.3–32; as noted above (n.35), the latter bears great similarity to PZ's account. Kavadh evidently expected that a show of force would suffice to persuade the inhabitants to surrender and was unprepared for a lengthy siege. Although the city had fallen to the Persians in 359, its defences had been considerably strengthened subsequently; Proc. *Wars* i.7.4 claims that there were no soldiers present in the city at the time of Kavadh's arrival, but he is undoubtedly exaggerating, although his claim is taken at face value by Lenski 2007, 220, cf. Meier 2009, 178. See Greatrex 2007c, 93, Trombley and Watt 2000, 54 n.260, and note vii.6f below for a reference to John, 'one of the Roman soldiers of Amida'. The absence of any senior military officer, however (see n.59 below), shows how unprepared the city was for an attack. For a recent discussion of the city's defences see Crow 2007, Lenski 2007, 220–2.

38 Syr. *šmay geldê*.

39 Syr. *kudnawata*, 'mules' or 'mounds', perhaps a wooden structure here rather than a ramp, so Debié 2003, 612 n.70.

40 On Sasanian expertise in siege warfare, which was significant, see Greatrex 1998, 58 and n.68 with Rance 2010, xi.1 n.5.

41 On Persian dislike for winter see Greatrex 1998, 83. *Ibid.* 86 on the deterioration of Persian bows caused by the weather with Rance 2010, xi.1 n.19. See also Debié 2003, 612 n.71.

42 Proc. *Wars* i.7.12 describes these tactics in similar terms, cf. Greatrex 1998, 85, Lenski 2007, 223.

defenders] made a breach in the wall from the inside to [reach] the material of the mound, and they carried the soil from outside to within [the wall]. With pieces of wood they propped up the hole in successive stages from underneath.⁴³ Selected Persian armed men who were wearing armour went up on the mound, placing wood against the wall so as to enter, while the king and his army were close by, assisting them outside with weapons⁴⁴ and with volleys of arrows, encouraging [them] with shouting, rallying them and urging them on. There were some five hundred men who were in his proximity and his sight. [The defenders] dropped from the wall strips of freshly flayed oxhide with fenugreek that was soaked with resin⁴⁵ and poured a liquid of fenugreek over the hides, making them slippery, and they set fire to the supports underneath [24] the mound. After they engaged one another in battle for about six hours and [the Persians] were prevented from entering, the fire flared up and consumed the wooden pieces of the supports, and suddenly the rest of the material was reduced to ashes from the intensity of the fire, and the mound collapsed and caved in. The Persians who were on it were both burned and pounded with stones from those who were on the wall, and the king retreated in shame and despair, taunted and insulted more and more by daring, shameless, and arrogant men because there was no bishop in the city to discipline them⁴⁶ and to keep them in order, for the bishop John had died a few days earlier. That Bishop John was a pure and chaste man, honourable in his [spiritual] practices; this [John] was from the monastery called 'Qartmin'.⁴⁷ He came when he was elected and became bishop but he did not alter his fasting, his deportment, and his [spiritual] practices, but rather was constant in his service by day and by night. He warned and admonished the wealthy of the city, saying that in a time of famine and [with] the coming of the Arabs and pestilence⁴⁸ they should not hoard grain in [such] a time of distress but sell [it] and give [it] to the needy, lest in hoarding it they store it for enemies, in accordance with the passage in

43 For this undermining of the besiegers' siegeworks cf. *Proc. Wars* i.7.14–16 with *Greatrex* 1998, 85–7 and *Trombley and Watt* 2000, 55 n.262.

44 Or '[war] display'.

45 Other possibilities include myrrh-oil (*HB* 154) and mallow.

46 Lit. 'to be a guide for them'. For the mocking of the Persians by the defenders cf. *Proc.* i.7.17–18, who claims that the city's prostitutes even exposed themselves to the king (thus persuading his advisers that he was destined to capture the city).

47 On bishop John see *Honigmann* 1951, 100; the Qartmin monastery was thriving at this time, as is described by *Palmer* 1990, 114–19.

48 PZ is referring here to the series of catastrophes that beset the eastern provinces towards the end of the fifth century that are narrated in detail by *Ps.-Josh.* See n.23 above.

Scripture, and so it happened.⁴⁹ The angel Gabriel appeared to him standing beside the altar table and foretold to him the arrival of the enemy, and [said] that he would be carried off as a righteous man ahead of the enemy. He announced this statement, delivering it before the people of the city in order that they repent and be spared the wrath [of God].

a. [25] The fourth chapter of the seventh book informs of how the city of Amida was captured and what happened to its inhabitants.

When Kavadh and his army failed in the various assaults that he made against the city and many of his soldiers had died, his hands were weakened and [he] asked that a small gift of money be given to him, and he would withdraw from the city.⁵⁰ Leontius, the head of the council, the son of Pappas, Cyrus the governor, and Paul the steward, the son of Zaynab, through those who were sent to Kavadh, demanded from him the price of cultivated vegetables that his army had consumed as well as of the grain and wine that they had gathered and brought from the villages.⁵¹ As he was very discouraged by these [demands] and was preparing to depart in humiliation, Christ appeared to him in a vision at night, as he eventually recounted, saying that he would hand over the inhabitants of the city in three days because they had sinned against him, and this happened as follows.⁵² At the western side of the city, towards the Tripyrgion,⁵³ was a guard of monks who

49 Luke 12.17–20, cf. Leviticus 26.16.

50 Trombley and Watt 2000, 55 n.263, speculate that PZ's opening phrase reflects a translation of a Greek genitive absolute, indicating the elapse of a period of time since the start of the siege. Over two months had passed since the beginning of the siege; PZ now relates the city's fall in January 503.

51 See Segal 1955, 110–14 on these officials and their role in city life. Leontius was the representative of the city council, the *boulê*. On Cyrus see *PLRE* ii, Cyrus 15; he was the governor (*praeses*) of Mesopotamia. Paul was the steward (*rab-bayta*), i.e. the official charged with managing church estates; cf. Ps.-Josh. 42, where the stewards come to the aid of the populace of Edessa during the famine of 500/1. At viii.5b PZ notes the case of Mara, a former steward who was promoted to bishop of Amida. The fact that the first official named is the representative of the council may reflect the fact that the defence of the city rested to a large degree on the willingness of the inhabitants to resist the enemy. See also Greatrex 1998, 90.

52 On the apparition of Christ see n.66 below. The fall of the city soon acquired this moralising element, see Luther 1997, 185–6, Debié 2003, 616–22, Meier 2009, 200.

53 For plans of Amida see Trombley and Watt 2000, 120 and map 5, Greatrex 1998, 82. The western side of the city was the most vulnerable, see Greatrex 1998, 90 and n.51. The Tripyrgion, the name of which refers in Greek to three towers, may refer to the section of the wall south of the Urfa (Edessa) gate on the western side, which projects outwards and culminates in the Ulu Badan tower, on which see Gabriel 1940, 97–9.

were stationed [there] from the monastery of John of the Urtâyê,⁵⁴ whose abbot was a Persian. Camped outside, opposite their watch tower, was a certain *marzban*, Kanarak the lame.⁵⁵ Day after day, while he vigilantly kept guard during the night and daytime, he was determined and clever in planning how he would capture the city. For there was someone whom those in the city called ‘The Qutriga’ because he was a criminal,⁵⁶ a troublesome man, and a thief, who was very bold in every way against the Persians and would dare to snatch from them livestock and goods, [26] so that they, being accustomed to hearing those on the wall calling out, also called him Qutriga. Kanarak used to watch this man and observed that he would go out through the streams⁵⁷ adjoining the Tripyrgion, make a raid, and enter again. For a while the Persians left him alone so that he could do what he wanted, noting and tracking his activities, and they would run after him to see from where he was going out and entering.

54 Brooks identifies Beth Urtâyê with Byzantine Anzitene, the region north of Amida and just west of Arzanene. See *PO* 17 (1923), 135 n.2, Honigmann 1951, 236, Witakowski 1996a, 5 n.38, Luther 1997, 174. Dillemann 1962, 313, gratuitously emends the text here to read Abarnia, rather than Urtâyê. Joh. Eph. *Lives*, *PO* 19 (1926), 214–19, gives the name of the archimandrite, Abraham, and describes how 300 of the monks sought refuge in the city during the siege; ninety of them were massacred when the city fell. See PZ viii n.118 on the location of the monastery. Rumours of treachery arose from the Persian connection of the abbot: see (e.g.) Ps.-Josh. 53, Marc. *com.* 502.2, with Greatrex 1998, 91 and n.52.

55 This looks like a rendering of the Persian title *kanarang*, which Proc. *Wars* i.5.4 puts into Greek as *khanarangês*, explaining it is a term for a general, cf. Khurshudian 1998, 72–5. As often, however, it may rather reflect a family name, that of the Khanarangian, a Parthian dynasty whose power-base lay in eastern Iran: see Pourshariati 2008, 266–71, cf. Christensen 1944, 102, Marquart 1901, 74–5. Given the heterogeneous nature of Kavadh’s army (see Greatrex 1998, 55), it is possible that Kavadh drew on forces from this distant region for his campaign, so Greatrex 1998, 90 n.50.

56 The word is uncertain but probably related to Gk. ‘thief’, cf. AK 339–40: Payne Smith suggested it was Gk. *lēistorikos*. The word is Syr. *loṭriqa* in the witnesses, except in Mich. Syr. ix.7 (258/158 with n.6), which reads *luṭiqara*, perhaps a corruption of *lektikarios*, as S. Brock has suggested. HB 156 n.4 derive Kutriga’s name from the Greek verb *katêgoreô*, I accuse, and infer that it means ‘the accused’. MS V adds the phrase *gbar hwa l’tykr*, the last word of which may be identified as the Greek *lēstrikos*, i.e. thieving, and which would therefore mean, ‘who was a thieving man’.

57 HB 156 translate *bibwata* as ‘aqueducts’, which is possible, but we prefer to render the word as ‘streams’. See Greatrex 1998, 90 n.51, Trombley and Watt 2000, 60 n.292. Gabriel 1940, 92 n.1, notes that the city is well provided with water sources, but a Roman aqueduct did exist, leading to the north-west corner of the city: see his fig.70 on p.96. The reference might be to the ravine overlooked by the Ulu Badan tower (see n.53 above), next to which several postern gates were situated. See Gabriel 1940, 98 fig.72. We are grateful to Jim Crow for help with this point.

b. Then it happened that on the night when the city was captured there was a thick darkness, and a dense cloud that sent down a gentle rain. Someone out of love gave hospitality to the monks who were guarding the Tripyrgion and wine flowed late into the evening. As a result, sleep overcame them, and they were not diligently wakeful as they normally were in their keeping watch.⁵⁸ When Kanarak along with some of his army came in pursuit after Qutriga and drew near to the wall, the monks did not cry out and did not throw down stones. The man realised that they were asleep and he sent for the ladders and his army, and whoever was with him entered the streams, climbed up the tower of the monks and killed them. They took the tower and the battlement, fastened ladders to the wall, and sent for the king. When their neighbours who were guarding another tower heard these things, they cried out, wanting to come to the monks who were being killed, but they were not able to [do so]; instead some of them were shot by Persian arrows and died. When word reached Governor Cyrus, he arrived with torches held close to him; [27] those who were carrying the torches were easily struck with arrows and he was wounded with an arrow from the Persians who were standing in the darkness, whereas they were not harmed by those who were shooting, and he retired having been wounded.⁵⁹

c. When it became morning and the king and his army arrived at the location, the ladders were fastened to the wall, and he commanded the army to climb up. Many of those who ascended died, some were struck by arrows and stones, and others were dislodged by spears. Those who out of fear turned back and went down the ladders were executed at the command of the king as though they were deserters and fugitives from battle.⁶⁰ Therefore the Persians were encouraged and gave themselves over to gain renown through victory and the capture of the city, or if they were struck down in battle they would not be blamed by the king and executed, because he was present and observed their fighting. The inhabitants of the city wanted to

58 Proc. Wars i.7.22–3 ascribes the monks' drinking to a celebration for a holy day. The night was that of Friday 9 January 503, cf. Greatrex 1998, 91 with Telelis 2004, no.113. Lenski 2007, 229, well brings out the exhaustion that must have afflicted the defenders during this prolonged siege.

59 The detail on Cyrus is significant, since, had there been a *dux* in the city at the time, it is certain that he would have been summoned. It follows therefore that no senior military commander was available.

60 For such ruthless tactics cf. Hdt. vii.223 (on the Persians at Thermopylae in 480 B.C.) and Greatrex 1998, 91–2, citing the tactics of Mehmet during the siege of Constantinople in 1453. The presence of the king was believed to instil courage in the soldiers, see Hdt. vii.212, viii.86–9.

loosen from below the keystone⁶¹ of the tower in which the Persians were, and they began to loosen the supports, but while this was happening, another tower was captured, and then another, and another, and the guards of the wall were killed.

d. Peter, an imposing man from 'Amkhor⁶² held the battlement on one side by himself, dressed in a coat of iron, and did not allow the Persians to pass, and those inside and outside who attacked him he repelled and threw back with a spear, while he was strengthened and standing like a warrior, until from the other side five or six towers were captured, and finally he also fled and was not killed. Then the Persians first seized the entire wall and held it, and killed and thrust back the guards over [the course of] one night, [28] one day, and another night. Finally they descended and opened the gates and the army entered, carrying out the command of the king to destroy men and women of every class and age for three days and three nights. A Christian prince of the country of Arran⁶³ pleaded with the king on behalf of one church called the Great Church of the Forty Martyrs and he spared it while it was full of people.⁶⁴

e. After three nights and days, the slaughter ceased at the command of the king, and men entered to guard the treasures of the church and of the nobles of the city, for whatever was found among them belonged to the king. He commanded also that the bodies of the slain that were in the squares and those whom they had crucified should be gathered and taken out to the northern side of the city so that the king could enter from the south. They were gathered, and as they went out they were numbered: they were eighty thousand, not including those who had been put in the inns and were placed in the streams and those left in the houses.⁶⁵ Then the king entered

61 Lit 'the crown of the egg [arch]'.

62 Following HB 157 and n.5; the meaning of Syr. 'mkr' is unknown, as is the location of 'Amkhor. Dillemann 1962, 314, proposes emending the text to Amuda (for which see n.101 below), but there are no grounds for this, see PZV ii, 18 n.4.

63 Arran is Caucasian Albania, see PZ xii n.199 with Land 1887, 190, noting the impact that this incident must have had on the Christians deported to the Caucasus.

64 On this church, constructed not long before this siege, see Palmer 1990, 116, Greatrex 1998, 83.

65 PZ's figures seem remarkably high, but Ps.-Josh. 53 offers precisely the same total. The issue is complicated by uncertainty in the text of Ammianus (xix.2.14) when he discusses the siege of 359: it is unclear whether there were 120,000 or 20,000 people in the city then, see Greatrex 1998, 93 n.59; Luther 1997, 183 n.320, is sceptical of PZ's figure, cf. Lenski 2007, 224. By way of comparison, Joh. Eph. HE vi.6, tr. in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 146–7, claims that the population of Apamea (and surrounding area), when it was captured by the Persians in 573, was 292,000; scholars are divided as to whether this figure can be accepted, see Greatrex

the treasury of the church, and when he saw there the icon of our lord Jesus, depicted in the likeness of a Galilean, he asked who it was, and they said it was the God of the Nazarenes.⁶⁶ He bowed his head before it and said, ‘He told me, “Stay and take from me the city and its inhabitants, because they have sinned against me.”’ He then took from among the sacred vessels many of silver and gold, and vestments of noble appearance, which were from Ishaq bar Bar‘ai, a consul and a rich man of the city who had given his inheritance to the church a few years earlier.⁶⁷ He found there good wine that was dried into its sediment, which used to be brought up [29] and was placed in the sun for a total of seven years, and eventually became dry. From this the stewards used to take some on their journeys, ground into dust in clean linen bags, and put a little bit of it in a mixture and drink with the pleasantness and taste of wine. To the unwitting they would say that it was a miraculous compound.⁶⁸ The king was greatly impressed by this, and he took it away, and from that time this craft of gastronomic delight has been lost among the clergy.

f. Gold and silver from the houses of the nobles and luxury garments were gathered and they were given to the treasurers of the king. Then they took down all of the bronze statues of the city, the sundials, and the marble and they collected the bronze and everything that they liked, and placing [it all] on rafts of wood that they made, they sent them down the river Tigris that passes by the east of the city and flows into their country.⁶⁹ Then the king searched for the leaders of the city and its administrators, and they brought to him Leontius, Governor Cyrus who was shot by an arrow, and the rest of the nobles. The Persians killed Paul the son of Zaynab the steward because they found he had a lot of gold, so that he would not divulge [this fact] to the king. They clothed Leontius and Cyrus in filthy garments [and] hung pig ropes on their necks. Making them carry pigs, they led them around while

and Lieu 2002, 283 n.64. Cf. Morony 2004, 175, who accepts these figures. PZ’s grim picture of widespread carnage, followed (section f below) by a further massacre of labourers due to be taken into captivity, is confirmed by Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 19 (1926), 218–19.

66 On this image of Christ, stored in the treasury of the Church of the Forty Martyrs, it appears, see Mundell [Mango] 1977, 65; cf. Meier 2003a, 531 and below on xii.4a.

67 Ishaq is mentioned also in Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 191, as a powerful and great patrician, whose descendant Thomas gave up his riches to lead an ascetic life, cf. AK 340–1.

68 Syr. *ḥnana*, a mixture of oil and dust used for anointing, see PZV ii, 19 n.4. We have been unable to find any parallels for the powdered wine described by PZ.

69 The Persians looted Antioch and Edessa in similar fashion in 540 and 609 respectively. See PD ii, 69/64 (tr. in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 107) on the former case. On Edessa and other similar cases see Whittow 1990, 17.

exclaiming and pointing them out, saying, ‘Governors who do not govern the city well and do not order its people not to insult the king deserve an insult such as this.’⁷⁰ Finally, [30] the important men and all of the master craftsmen were collected up in fetters and set aside as the king’s captives. They were sent to his country with an armed force that took them down.⁷¹ Influential men in the king’s army approached him and said, ‘Our families and our brothers have been killed in battle by the inhabitants of the city,’ and they asked him that one tenth of the men be given to them as compensation for vengeance. They gathered and counted out and gave to them in proportion to the group, and they put them to death, killing them in every manner.⁷² The king bathed in the baths of Paul the son of Zaynab and after the winter he departed from the city.⁷³ He stationed the general Aglon there as commander, two *marzbans*, a force of about three thousand to guard the city, and John bar Hablâhâ from among the wealthy and Sergius bar Zabduni to govern them.⁷⁴

g. Then in the summer the Romans arrived. Their commanders were Patricius, the great general, a just and believing old man but lacking in intellect, and Hypatius and Celer the *magister officiorum*, and eventually also Areobindus. With them was the *comes* Justin, who would become emperor after Anastasius.⁷⁵ They assembled and attacked the city with towers of wood

70 As well as being humiliated by the Persians, Cyrus was nearly executed later by the *magister officiorum* Celer because of his failure to prevent the fall of Amida: see Ps.-Josh. 80 with Trombley and Watt 2000, 98 n.459.

71 On the deportation of these people to a new city founded by Kavadh (Veh-az-Amid-Kavadh) see Luther 1997, 183–4, Greatrex 1998, 93, Morony 2004, 171–2, Boerm 2007, 174–5. The Persians frequently boosted their manpower in this way, see Lieu 1986, Kettenhofen 1996, 300–1, Morony 2004; as Morony stresses, however, the Romans employed the same practice, e.g. in the following year (Ps.-Josh. 75).

72 On the bloody aftermath of the city’s capture see Greatrex 1998, 92–3.

73 Cf. Ps.-Josh. 75 on Kavadh’s bath, adding that so delighted was the king with his experience that he ordered baths to be installed in all Persian cities. See Segal 1955, 131, Debié 2003, 614–15.

74 See *PLRE* ii, Glones, Greatrex 1998, 93–4, Pourshariati 2008, 103, associating Aglon with the Mihran family. John and Sergius are not otherwise attested; Segal 1955, 112, suggests that they were appointed *stratēgoi*, officials entrusted with the day-to-day running of the city. Proc. i.7.33 estimates the garrison at 1000 rather than 3000.

75 Proc. Wars i.8.1–5 gives a fuller list of commanders sent, as does Theoph. 145.17–146.5. PZ’s portrayal of Patricius is surprising, since he enjoyed a long and successful career. He is wrong to state that Areobindus was sent later; in fact, Celer was sent to the front after Hypatius, Patricius and Areobindus. See *PLRE* ii, Celer 2, Greatrex 1998, 94–6, for details. Cf. Ps.-Josh. 54, who estimates the size of the army sent at 52,000 men.

and excavations and all kinds of siege works.⁷⁶ They set on fire the gate of the city that was called the gate of Mar Za‘ûrâ, in order to gain entry against the Persians.⁷⁷ However, they were prevented from doing so because they were relaxing, and they did not enter because the Persians had sealed off the gate. The Romans did not capture it or take it from them in battle; nevertheless the population that was trapped in it was afflicted with famine day [31] after day until finally the people began to eat one another. Although it is a terrible and sad subject, I will narrate in this fifth chapter of the seventh book how this happened because it is true.

a. The fifth chapter of the seventh book gives information concerning the famine that took place during the siege of Amida and how the Persians went out from it and departed to their country.

As was said above, King Kavadh, when he departed from Amida with this army to his country, stationed the commander Aglon, two *marzbans* with an army of about 3000 to guard the city, two or three of the wealthy, and some of the local population, but the commanders of the Romans were not strong enough to capture the city and take it. Finally, Patricius went down to Persian Arzanene and took some captives, and captured fortresses there.⁷⁸ Areobindus and Hypatius went down to Nisibis but they did not capture it, although the citizens favoured the Romans and showed themselves lazy in battle. However, when King Kavadh heard, he came with an army against the Romans and they fled before him, abandoning their tents and heavy [equipment] that they had with them.⁷⁹ Areobindus fled from Harzem in

76 In fact, Hypatius and Patricius undertook this siege, while Areobindus operated further south. See Greatrex 1998, 96–7 with the map at 95.

77 The position of this gate is uncertain; according to Luther 1997, 188 n.334, it was named after the church of Mar Za‘ûrâ. Given that the Romans succeeded in burning the gate, the Persians were presumably able to block the gateway up by other means, thus again barring entrance to the city.

78 On Patricius’ offensive into Arzanene see Greatrex 1998, 97 n.72; it may have taken place during the Roman siege of Amida. Proc. Wars i.8.21–2 ascribes the raid on Arzanene to Celer, but his account here is highly unreliable, see Trombley and Watt 2000, 96 n.453. On the deportations see Morony 2004, 172, who identifies this raid with that reported by Ps.-Josh. 79, which is unlikely since other sources specify a more southerly route for Celer’s offensive, on which see Greatrex 1998, 113–14 (*contra* Trombley and Watt 2000, 96 nn.450–3).

79 Hypatius did not serve with Areobindus in this campaign, see Greatrex 1998, 97 and n.72, Trombley and Watt 2000, 67 n.322. Theoph. 147.6–24 (tr. in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 68–9) gives a more detailed and favourable account of Areobindus’ operations, claiming that he actually drove Kavadh back from Nisibis, but was then forced back by superior Persian numbers in July 503. PZ’s claim of support for Rome among the Nisibenes is inherently plausible: see Lee 1993, 575, 583, although his criticism of Areobindus’ campaign is exaggerated.

Apadana, while Hypatius, Patricius and others fled from Tell Qeşrê, and many horses and their riders perished when they fell from the steep cliffs of the mountains and were maimed and died or were injured.⁸⁰ Only the warlike Farzman was victorious in battle a number of times, and was famous and feared by the Persians, whose name made them tremble, and whose activities destroyed them and weakened them, and they were found to be cowards and fell before him. [32] He finally came to Amida with five hundred horsemen and he kept watch on the Persians who went out to the villages and killed some of them and carried off the livestock that they had with them and their horses.⁸¹

b. There was introduced to him a crafty man whom I know by the name of Gadana from the village of Akharê.⁸² He made an agreement with him to deceive and bring out Aglon, the commander of the Persian army, with three or four hundred horsemen. Because this man Gadana was known for hunting wild game, partridges, and doves,⁸³ he used to have permission to enter before Aglon, carrying to him in his hands a present from the hunt, eat the food in his company, and then receive from him out of the property of the city a price equal in value to the game. Eventually he said to him that the Romans, about one hundred men and five hundred cavalry, were seven miles from the city, in a place called “Shepherds’ Fold.”⁸⁴ Acting as though he were a friend he advised him to go out and capture the livestock, killing the Romans and making a name for himself. He sent out spies and they saw a few Romans and the cavalry. When they returned and informed him, he made preparations and led with him four hundred horsemen, but this Gadana

80 PZ here alludes to the battle near Apadna in August 503, on which see Greatrex 1998, 100–1; Proc. Wars i.8.18 likewise refers to the cliffs from which the fleeing Romans fell, cf. also Ps.-Josh. 57. Areobindus, as he retreated westwards, had asked his colleagues at Amida for help, but they arrived too late, as Ps.-Josh. 55–6 relates, cf. Theoph. 146.16–147.5. Arzamon and Apadana/Apadna are well attested in other sources; PZ’s Tell Qeşrê may also refer to Arzamon, i.e. to the river Arzamon. For discussion see Dillemann 1962, 315–16 and the map in Greatrex 1998, 95. See also map 2 below.

81 Proc. Wars i.9.5–19 offers a similar and detailed account of the ambushing of Aglon; Luther 1997, 188 suggests use of a common source, cf. Greatrex, forthcoming. Cf. Ps.-Josh. 56 with Trombley and Watt 2000, 68 n.324. See also Greatrex 1998, 98–9, *PLRE* ii, Pharesmanes 3.

82 An interesting reference, since it provides the name of one of PZ’s sources – or rather, one of his source’s sources, since the man who compiled the *Chronicle* in 569 is unlikely to have known someone who was alive in 503, cf. Greatrex 2006, 43 and Introduction, C (3)(viii). Gadana is not otherwise attested.

83 MS A: ‘and partridges and fish’, see PZT ii, 32 n. 5.

84 Syr. ‘*epta ra’ên*, not otherwise attested. Proc. Wars i.8.14 places the ambush at Thilasamon, which on map 1 in Honigsmann 1935 is situated about 10 km south-west of Amida.

[who was] on a mule led him and brought him down to the middle of the Roman camp, into their ambush. Thus the Romans destroyed the Persians and brought the head of Aglon to Constantia. Then distress and rage seized the son of Aglon, and the *marzbans* who were there [in Amida] became cautious and did not allow the inhabitants who were trapped in the city to go out to the market that used to be held alongside the wall by peasants from the villages bringing wine, wheat, and [33] other produce [and] selling them to the Persians and to the citizens. Cavalry would accompany them, taking a certain number at a time, and escort them in. By a virtuous law of the Persians no one dared to take anything from the villagers, who sold for whatever [price] they wanted and they received compensation in money and in goods from the city, and so they regularly attended the country market.

c. Then the market stopped because of the killing of Aglon and of the cavalry, and the important men who remained in the city and some ten thousand men were seized and imprisoned in the stadium and were kept there without food. Some of them died, and others ate their sandals and their excrement and drank their urine. Finally they attacked one another, and when they were all about to perish, those who remained in the stadium were released into the city like dead men from their graves. Starving women who were found in gangs seized some of the men by seduction, by deceit, and by craftiness, and overpowering them killed and ate them; more than five hundred men were eaten by women.⁸⁵ The affliction and the severity of the famine that happened in this city surpassed the one that arose during the capture of Samaria and the devastation of Jerusalem described in Scripture and recounted by Josephus.⁸⁶

d. At last Farzman came to the city and made an agreement with the Persians who were in it because they too had become weak. The commanders of the Romans and the Persians sat down at the gate of the city while the Persians were going out, carrying as much as they could and were not

⁸⁵ The Persians evidently ruled with a light touch until the killing of Aglon. Given that the Romans had been besieging the city until recently, the holding of markets outside the walls seems surprising, but *De pol. sci. dial.* iv.68–9 praises the aid offered by the Persians to populations suffering from famine. Ps.-Josh. 76–7 confirms PZ's grisly account of the imprisonment of the starving populace within the amphitheatre and the cannibalism to which some women resorted, cf. *Proc. Wars* i.9.21–2 with discussion in Stathakopoulos 2004, no.81; see also Meier 2009, 209, for some modern parallels.

⁸⁶ 2 Kings 6.24–33; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vi.392–434. PZ omits Kavadh's unsuccessful attack on Edessa in the wake of his victory near Apadna, on which see Greatrex 1998, 101–7; nor does he relate the Roman counter-offensive in 504, on which see Greatrex 1998, 108–14, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 71–3, Haarer 2006, 62–3.

searched. If they were accompanied by some of the citizens, they were asked if they wanted to remain or if they wished [34] to go with the Persians, and thus they departed from the city.⁸⁷ They gave eleven hundred pounds of gold to Kavadh through Celer, the *magister officiorum*, in exchange for the rescue of the city and peace. When the documents were written, they delivered drafts for the king to sign. The king slept and it was said to him in a vision that he should not make peace. When he awoke he tore up the paper and then departed to his country, taking the gold with him.⁸⁸

e. Farzman remained in the city to administer its inhabitants and the province.⁸⁹ From the emperor there was a remittance of tribute for seven years, and he treated its inhabitants⁹⁰ with kindness, bestowing gifts lavished on those who returned from exile, and he peacefully received each person according to his rank.⁹¹ The city was at peace and was resettled, and further construction was added to the wall.⁹² On the advice of Donatus,⁹³ Thomas, who was a calm and pleasant man, a monk, a councillor, and merciful bishop, was sent to the city.⁹⁴ The economy of God also called and selected

87 This deal was concluded in January 505 after the Romans had once again attempted, without success, to blockade the city: see Greatrex 1998, 114–15, Haarer 2006, 63.

88 Proc. *Wars* i.9.4 refers to 1000 lbs. of gold, Ps.-Josh. 81 merely alludes to presents handed over to Kavadh. Despite what PZ says here, no further fighting took place: Kavadh was in any case distracted by a Hunnic invasion in the Caucasus, as reported by Proc. *Wars* i.8.24, see Greatrex 1998, 110 n.104. PZ conflates the hand-over of Amida and the negotiations that took place on the frontier in November 506, at which a truce was agreed, as described by Ps.-Josh. 97–8; see Luther 1997, 213–16, Greatrex 1998, 115–18.

89 Farzman took over from Hypatius in command at Amida later in 505 following the latter's recall; probably at this point he was also promoted to the rank of *magister militum per Orientem*. See Luther 1997, 208, 210, *PLRE* ii, Pharesmanes 3. Ps.-Josh. 90 confirms the active role he played in promoting the revival of Amida, noting how he helped to reduce the wild animal population in the area.

90 With MS A; MS V reads 'the inhabitants of the imperial city,' which is certainly wrong.

91 Ps.-Josh. 66, 78, 92, 99 with Trombley and Watt 2000, 117 n.544 and Greatrex 1998, 118, offers more detail on the various remissions of tribute accorded by Anastasius.

92 The Romans clearly made every effort to repopulate the city. The rebuilding of the walls kept the city safe until the early seventh century, when the whole region fell into Persian hands; on Anastasius' work see Crow 2007, 443–4. Kettenhofen 1996, 301, is sceptical of the reference to the return of captives, to which Proc. *Wars* i.7.34–5 also alludes, regarding it as Sasanian propaganda.

93 Syr. Dith: see nn.5, 9 above. Cf. vii.1a, where PZ refers to Donatus' brother John. Nothing further is known of Donatus, who was evidently a prominent citizen of Amida; he died in the early 550s, as is clear from xii.6.

94 PZ's account of Thomas' appointment passes over important details related by Ps.-Josh. 83. According to Ps.-Josh., Nonnus was consecrated bishop by Flavian at Antioch at the request of the Amidenes; PZ viii.5b further reports that the previous bishop, John, had foretold his

for there the righteous Samuel from the monastery of the *katharoi*, who was a miracle worker and a remover of doubts,⁹⁵ and he sustained the city by his prayer and also helped its inhabitants.⁹⁶

a. The sixth chapter of the seventh book concerns how the village of Dara in Mesopotamia was built on the border of Roman territory in the time of Emperor Anastasius and bishop Thomas of the city of Amida.

Anastasius brought not a few accusations against the generals and commanders [35] of the Romans who arrived in the imperial city after the contest of war with the Persians, because they did not succeed and win by war, conquering the Persians and driving them out from Amida according to his will under our Lord, but by the gifts and gold that were sent from him. They defended themselves, saying that it was difficult for the generals to fight a king who, like [in] the word of God, though he was an Assyrian and an enemy, was sent by our Lord to the land of the Romans for the punishment of sins, and on account of the magnitude of the army that was with him.⁹⁷ Furthermore, it was not easy for them in his absence to capture Nisibis because they had no siege works ready or a place of refuge for rest, because the fortresses were remotely located and were too small to receive the army, and the water and other food supplies that were in them were not adequate.⁹⁸

b. They were urging him that a city should be built at his command on the side of the mountain, as a place of refuge for the army and a resting place, for the preparation and storage of weapons, and for the protection

elevation. Thomas, the *chôrepiskopos*, was meanwhile sent to Constantinople to oversee the Amidene community there; these people then arranged for him to be made bishop with the emperor's approval. Nonnus therefore only succeeded to the post in 519, as PZ relates at viii.5b. See Honigsmann 1951, 100, Luther 1997, 207–8, Trombley and Watt 2000, 101 n.472.

⁹⁵ Daniel 5.12.

⁹⁶ Samuel is probably to be identified with the Samuel of Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1926), 216, who set up a monastery around this time. Whether this monastery was that of the Qattare, i.e. *katharoi*, 'the pure ones', is uncertain; as AK 343 surmise, it no doubt lay in the vicinity of Amida, but is not otherwise attested.

⁹⁷ PZ seems well informed about discussions at the imperial court. The Persians were indeed frequently cast as Assyrians who chastised the empire because of the sins of its inhabitants, see e.g. *V. Sym. Styl. Iun.* 57, tr. in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 105, cf. 2 Kings 18.10–12, Isaiah 10.23–5 for biblical precedents. One would not expect generals, however, to be making such arguments, and it is noteworthy that more pragmatic grounds are also offered to justify their poor performance.

⁹⁸ The generals' arguments are sound: since the cession of Nisibis to the Persians in 363, the Romans lacked a stronghold near the frontier and were thus hampered in any attempt to go on the offensive.

of the territory of the ‘Arab from bands of Persians and Ṭayyayê.⁹⁹ Some of them mentioned to him Dara, others mentioned ‘Amodin.¹⁰⁰ He sent a message to bishop Thomas of Amida and sent engineers who drafted a plan, and this holy Thomas brought it up with him to the emperor. The emperor and the nobles agreed to build [up] Dara into a city.¹⁰¹ At that time [36] Felicissimus was the *dux*, an energetic and wise man who was not greedy out of love of money but was just and a friend of workers¹⁰² and the poor.¹⁰³

c. King Kavadh was fighting with the Ṭamorâyê and other enemies of his country,¹⁰⁴ and so Emperor [Anastasius] gave gold to bishop Thomas as the value of the village that belonged to the church and he purchased it for the treasury.¹⁰⁵

99 On the ‘Arab see n.22 above. The Ṭayyayê are the Arab tribes of the region, cf. e.g. Trombley and Watt 2000, n.98. Originally they were a particular Arab tribe in the region of Edessa, but because of their frequent contact with Syriac speakers, the term came to mean ‘Arab’ generally, at least as early as the fifth century.

100 Dara lay 10.4 km from the Persian frontier and 26 km from Nisibis. Amudis (variously spelt: PZ has ‘Amodin, Proc. refers to it as Ammodius) lay due south of Dara, on the main route from Nisibis to Constantia and Edessa. See Dillemann 1962, 159, 228 and map 4 below; also Whitby 1986b, 740 (a plan), 749–50. For further details on the construction of the fortress see Proc. Wars i.10.13–18, Marc. com. a.518, Joh. Lyd., *De Mag.* iii.47, most translated in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 74–7. Work began in late 505. Modern discussions of the site in Collinet 1924, Gregory 1997, ii, 80–8, Zanini 2003, 202–4, Rist 2004 (on PZ’s account in particular, and comparing his account to that of other ancient sources). Ensslin 1927 offers an inconclusive discussion of the sources, suggesting that Mal. used a similar source to PZ.

101 The large role assigned to the church in the building work is not unusual. See di Segni 1995, 322, noting Cyr. Scyth. V. Sab. 72–3, where the bishop Barachus of Bacatha is entrusted with the funds to build a fort; see also Segal 1955, 114–15, Rapp 2005, 220–3. It may be, however, as Janniard 2003, 369, points out, that the church’s role was essentially in overseeing the finances (cf. C.J. i.4.26). Croke 1984, 84, notes that Calliopius, mentioned in Marc. com.’s account (a.518), may have seen to the day-to-day running of operations on site. Thomas, as is known from Ps.-Josh. (see n.95), enjoyed good contacts in the imperial capital.

102 Or, less likely, ‘soldiers’: Syr. *palḥa* is ambiguous.

103 See PLRE ii, Felicissimus 2. PZ’s praise of him is cast in very similar terms to those in which his approval of Belisarius is registered at ix.2a.

104 An important brief remark, since it explains how the Romans were able to proceed with the building without being molested: see Whitby 1988, 212–13, on the difficulties presented by the erection of fortresses close to enemy territory. The Ṭamorâyê may have been a tribe in the Caucasus or in Iran; they are referred to also by Ps.-Josh. 22, 24. See Luther 1997, 145–6, esp. n.181, Greatrex 1998, 50, Trombley and Watt 2000, 20 n.96. Altheim 1960, 20–1, wrongly seeks to identify them with the Arab tribe of the Thamudeni. Kavadh also had an invasion of Huns in the Caucasus to deal with, see n.88 above.

105 Church domains by the early sixth century were extensive and might include whole villages. See (e.g.) Segal 1955, 118, Flusin 1998, 500–3. The freed inhabitants, together with the soldiers garrisoning the city, became its first inhabitants, cf. Mundell 1975, 223, Rist 2004, 252.

He freed all of the settlers¹⁰⁶ who were in it and donated to each one his own land and his own dwelling. He contributed several hundred pounds of gold for the building of the church of the city.¹⁰⁷ He promised under oath that all that the bishop expended he would give with a generous hand and would not go back [on his promise]. Finally, he issued a decree in full detail that the city would be built without delay under the direction of the bishop, while the craftsmen, slaves, and peasants who were required for the assembly of material there would gain and benefit. He sent many stonecutters and masons and ordered that no one be defrauded of his wage for his work, as he clearly realised and astutely understood that in this way it was possible for a city to be built quickly on the frontier. When they set out with the help of our Lord and began, there were supervisors and foremen there over the projects: the priests Cyrus 'Adon and Eutychian, the deacons Paphnutius, Sergius and John, and others from the clergy of Amida, while bishop [Thomas] made frequent personal visits there.¹⁰⁸

d. A vast amount of gold was provided without interruption for the craftsmen and workers of every kind, [37] [at the rates] set as follows. The labourer had four *keratia* per day, and if he had an ass with him, eight *keratia*.¹⁰⁹ Many became exceedingly rich from it, and because it was reported that the work was honest and the wages were paid, workers and craftsmen flocked from East and West. The overseers who were [appointed] over the work were compensated very well¹¹⁰ and their purses were filled because they found the man to be generous,¹¹¹ gentle, and kind, a just man who believed the upright emperor and the promises that were given to him. In two or three years the city was built and, as we might say, suddenly sprouted up on the border.

106 Syr. *tawtaba* can mean also 'foreigner' or 'lodger': the word may refer to a tenant farmer or some similar institution.

107 Proc. *Aed.* ii.3.26 refers to two churches, cf. Mundell 1975, 219, Haarer 2006, 69. One of them was situated above one of the cisterns: see Brands 2004.

108 These churchmen are not otherwise known; Rist 2004, 252 n.41, notes that the first person named might actually be two people, i.e. Cyrus and 'Adon, rather than one. PZ plainly had access to detailed information on the construction of the city, and especially on the church's involvement; given the positive tone with which Thomas' conduct is described, it is likely that PZ's source was in some way connected with him. Collinet 1924, 58, emphasises PZ's insistence on how the workers were entitled to proper remuneration for their efforts, since often such work was imposed, cf. Trombley and Watt 2000, 100 n.512, Rist 2004, 253.

109 The *keration* was worth 1/24 of a *solidus*. This would be the normal month's wage for unskilled work, and thus represents a very large payment. See Morrisson 1989, 258 and Trombley and Watt 2000, 110 n.511 for more *comparanda*.

110 Or 'were very active.'

111 Lit. 'good of eye.' The reference is to Thomas, bishop of Amida.

e. When Kavadh heard and tried to destroy [it], he could not because a wall had been raised and built which was a defence for those taking refuge behind it.¹¹² A large public bath and a spacious storehouse were built, and an aqueduct that came to the outskirts of the mountain, and wonderful cisterns in the city that received the water.¹¹³ Inspectors were being sent frequently from the emperor to the bishop, and they all brought back good reports about his integrity and justice to the emperor. He was very pleased with him, and he kept sending gold in reply to his requests and fulfilled them without delay. Finally the number of hundreds of pounds that he sent was counted, and the bishop sent a message in writing to the emperor that, speaking in the presence of God, the sum had been expended on the work, and nothing remained from it in his possession or was delivered to his church. He [Thomas] promptly sent him [Anastasius] an official receipt that the treasury had received all of the gold which had been sent by him for the construction that took place in the city, and that it had been expended.

f. Dara was named Anastasiopolis after the just emperor. He swore [38] by his crown that no statement of accounts would be required from Thomas and from his church, neither by him nor by any who became emperor after him. [Thomas] appointed and consecrated as the first bishop of [the new city] the priest Eutychian,¹¹⁴ a conscientious man who was experienced in business, and he gave the privilege to collect alms¹¹⁵ to his church from the authority of the church of Amida. John, a Roman soldier from Amida, was assigned to him. Eutychian tonsured him and made him a priest and master of the *xenodocheion*. When [Thomas] went to the imperial city he came with him.¹¹⁶ When [Eutychian] was presented to the emperor, [Anastasius] gave an endowment to his church. Abraham bar Kaili from Telmidê,¹¹⁷ the

112 On Kavadh's reaction see also Ps.-Josh. 90, who claims that he sought to prevent the building work, and Proc. *Wars* i.10.17, who reports that Anastasius assuaged Kavadh's anger with bribes. See Greatrex 1998, 121 and n.5.

113 See Whitby 1986b, 749–50 on these buildings, also Rist 2004, 253–4; Proc. *Aed.* ii.1.4–3.26 likewise provides a detailed description of the installations of the new city. See also Ensslin 1927, 342–3, on the baths.

114 Subsequently the bishop was raised to metropolitan status, see Honigsmann 1951, 103–4, Mundell 1975, 221, Whitby 1986b, 751. Eutychian was the recipient of a letter from Jacob of Serug, *ep.* 33, 247–50.

115 Or 'certain rights'.

116 The *xenodocheion* was the guest house, cf. *ODB* 2208. John is not otherwise known. The close ties between the Amidene church and Constantinople in this period are clear.

117 Or 'Telbandê' or 'Telba'rê'. The text is uncertain, as is the location. This Abraham bar Kaili (also referred to as bar Kayli or Kaïli) later became bishop of Amida himself and a vigorous persecutor of the anti-Chalcedonians, cf. PZ x.2 and PD ii, 32–3/32–3.

son of Ephraem of Constantia, who was at the time the notary assigned to bishop Eutychian, was also made a priest and was sent to become the supervisor over the works and the construction of the public bath, and eventually became steward of the church.

g. The emperor gave to Eutychian gifts of sacred vessels and gold for the building of the great church to be built in the city and sent him off. The bishop lived a little while longer and then he died. Then after him Thomas bar 'Abdiya, who was a soldier from Resh'aina, became [bishop]. He was the steward of the church of Amida, and he too was watchful and experienced with regard to business matters. John, the master of the *xenodocheion*, a righteous and chaste man was faithful to him and beloved by him. When this pious Thomas departed from his see out of zeal for the faith, this faithful John joined him, and he made him *chôrepiskopos*, spending some seventeen ears [living] as a stranger in various places. He did not [39] exchange his truth¹¹⁸ and died in the year three when Khusro went up to Antioch, when he was joined with the monks who departed from Mardê before the enemies.¹¹⁹ He was buried in the monastery of Bet Tirai and he was placed beside his bishop who had already gone to his rest.¹²⁰

a. The seventh chapter of the seventh book concerns the removal of Macedonius the heretic from the imperial city.

Macedonius the bishop of Constantinople did not permit himself any secrecy of his inner self to hide his opinion, but like the fruit that bursts forth in its day, as Job said,¹²¹ and 'what is hidden will be revealed, and what takes place in the inner rooms will be announced from the rooftops,' as it also says in the gospel;¹²² he [was attached]¹²³ to the monks of the Akoimetai [Monastery] who were about one thousand and who made excessive use

118 According to the text. This passage is construed in HB 168 with n.3 as, 'and he sent him to Aleppo [Beroea].'

119 Thomas remained bishop until he was expelled in 519; see PZ viii.5b. John is not otherwise attested; Resh'aina is the Greek Theodosiopolis (in Osrhoene). His period of exile will have lasted more than 17 years if he too was expelled in 519, since PZ dates his death to indiction 3, i.e. 539/40. That there were anti-Chalcedonian monks in Mardê in 540 seems surprising, given the crackdown on their communities in 536 and the years following (on which see x.1 below); the reference may rather therefore be to the area around the town.

120 This monastery is referred to also at viii.5c and placed near Resh'aina. See PZ viii n.122.

121 Job 32.19 (Peshitta).

122 Luke 12.2–3.

123 Lacunae in the manuscript filled as HB 168 suggest.

of baths and bodily refreshments.¹²⁴ They appeared honourable to people outside, adorned in the habit of chastity, but like whitewashed tombs on the inside they were filled with defilement because they agreed to the wish of Macedonius: every year he used to commemorate Nestorius, as happened in other monasteries of his opinion. They did so in their monastery along with him and in other dwellings; for this reason they had access to Macedonius.¹²⁵

b. They were constantly engaged in reading the writings of the school of Diodore [of Tarsus] and Theodore [of Mopsuestia]¹²⁶ and from an anthology of their writings, and the work of Theodoret concerning the proceedings of the council [of Chalcedon], which is not the one that is translated into Syriac.¹²⁷ [40] Macedonius produced a book and decorated it with gold and said that it was by the holy fathers and teachers of the church. When he showed it to the emperor, it was not acceptable to him, but he [Anastasius] said to him [Macedonius], 'These things are not needed by you; instead, go and burn this.' When he perceived the will of the emperor, he even plotted¹²⁸ to make a rebellion against him and was regularly calling him a heretic and a Manichaean.¹²⁹ The *magister officiorum* was inclined towards [Macedonius]

124 The Akoimêtai ('Sleepless ones') were a community of monks who offered unceasing prayer to God by means of a shift system; they were fiercely loyal supporters of Chalcedon. The hostile tone adopted by PZ towards them is therefore unsurprising. By the mid-fifth century they had established their monastery outside Constantinople itself, at Eirenaion on the Bosporus. See *ODB* i.46, Janin 1975, 16–17, Grillmeier ii.2, 265–6/252–3. On the size of monasteries in Constantinople at this time see Hatlie 2007, 109; for PZ's hostile attitude to baths see Yegül 1992, 314–20.

125 For the frequent characterisation of supporters of Chalcedon (by their opponents) as Nestorians see PZ iii n.12.

126 See PZ iii n.25 on Theodore and Diodore.

127 The work of Theodoret here referred to is probably the *Eraniêtês*, which actually dates from 448, just before the Council of Chalcedon. It consists of 238 extracts from 88 works and is an attack upon the doctrines of Eutyches. See Richard 1951, 725, Urbainczyk 2002, 26–7. The work itself may be found in *PG* 83.28–336. It might alternatively be a work known as the *Pentalogos*, written against the decisions of the Council of Ephesus and in particular against Cyril of Alexandria, of which only a few fragments survive. This work was condemned at the Council of Constantinople in 553 and was clearly deemed offensive by opponents of Chalcedon. See Richard 1951, 723–4. On Syriac translations of Theodoret see Baumstark 1922, 106–7; that of the *Eraniêtês* was made at a late stage. On the collection of extracts referred to see appendix 1 below.

128 See PZ ix n.176.

129 Th. Lect. 485, cf. *ibid.* 448 and Evagr. iii.32, confirms that Anastasius was called a Manichaean (although they claim that it was the people who called him this), cf. *ACO* iii, p.74.29–31, tr. in Vasiliev 1950, 141. See Charanis 1974, 41 n.18, Whitby 2000a, 172 n.112 on such allegations; according to Grillmeier ii.1, 360/319, the accusation implied that the accused denied the reality of the incarnation, which accounts for its use against opponents of Chalcedonians,

because he was bribed by him, but the report was brought to the emperor's attention by some truthful men who were not conversant with flattery.¹³⁰ [The emperor] held an audience and stated the insult in the presence of his patriicians with which Macedonius had insulted him. Being upset and weeping he adjured them that if in truth they did not approve of the emperor, or if they knew that he had the taint of heresy, they should not be afraid to accept from him his authority, and depose him as though he were an unbeliever. They fell before him on their faces, weeping, and railed against Macedonius' audacity, shouting and accusing him and praising the emperor, and they arranged for his banishment. So that the *magister officiorum* who had helped [Macedonius] would be humiliated, he was ordered to deport him when he was sent to Oasis.¹³¹ They also arrested Pascasius the deacon who was attached to Macedonius and who was a close friend.¹³² He wrote in the

cf. Lieu 1994, 224–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 630 n.77. Ironically, Anastasius may have legislated against Manichaeans (*C.J.* i.5.11, dated to 487 or 510, *RSCC* no.533) and actually accused Pope Symmachus of being one, cf. Haarer 2006, 135 (based on Schwartz 1934, p.154.15).

130 The role of Celer (the *magister officiorum*, oddly never actually named in this context by PZ) emerges clearly from both Th. Lect. and PZ, but PZ's portrayal of his role and of the council of patriicians is less convincing than Theodore's version. Celer's loyalty to the emperor is assured by the length of his career: he continued in office until the emperor's death, cf. *PLRE* ii, Celer and Greatrex 1996a, 126–7. See also Haarer 2006, 151 n.155, on his role.

131 Macedonius was exiled to Euchaita in Pontus, not Oasis (in Egypt): on PZ's error here see n.165 below. The account here offered of Macedonius' deposition is unique; it is essentially a summary of the letter quoted by PZ *in extenso* in the following chapter. PD ii, 8–9/10–11, is based on PZ. Other sources, notably Th. Lect. 487–92 (= Theoph. 154.25–155.21), who is as favourable to Macedonius as PZ is hostile, describe how Celer, the *magister officiorum*, sought to drive a wedge between the patriarch and his Chalcedonian supporters by gaining his approval for a document which accepted the first two ecumenical councils but omitted reference to the following two (including Chalcedon). Macedonius then had to justify his conduct to the monks and the populace, who were now suspicious of his orthodoxy. Anastasius finally removed the patriarch (whose popularity, according to Th. Lect., remained undimmed) by suborning two people, who accused him of pederasty and heresy; the former charge was quickly exposed as spurious, however, when it became clear that Macedonius was actually a eunuch, Evagr. iii.32. Celer expelled the patriarch from his quarters and Anastasius, fearing the outcome of a public trial, quietly removed him from the capital. Brief notices on the patriarch's fall may also be found in Marc. *com.* a.511, Vict. Ton. §83 (a.501), Lib. *Brev.* 19/134. See too Evagr. iii.31, the text of a letter from monks in Palestine concerning these events. See Schwartz 1934, 243–4, Frend 1979, 185–95, Haarer 2006, 149–51, Meier 2007, 221–5, Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, on the whole episode.

132 Pascasius is mentioned by Sev. *Contra gramm. Or. III., pars prior*, 294/207 as a deacon of Macedonius. According to Severus 'he was seized with [Macedonius'] book in his hand; he was arrested by (order) of the glorious princes because he was the deacon of Macedonius and his supporter in the Jewish religion', cf. Lebon 1909, 126 n.4 for a French translation.

records of the acts¹³³ in the presence of the prefect all of his deeds and those of certain monks and others who had made an uproar in the city against proclaiming there ‘God who was crucified for us’ as has been done in all the jurisdiction of Antioch since the time when Eustathius was bishop.¹³⁴

c. I have accurately written out below when and how these things were done for the edification of the readers.

a. [41] The eighth chapter of the seventh book is about the letter that was sent from Constantinople on account of the removal of Macedonius. The letter of the priest Simeon and his brothers, the monks who were with him from the East, who at that time happened to be in the imperial city, and who wrote to their abbot Samuel concerning the removal of Macedonius is as follows.¹³⁵

133 The acts (Gk. *praxis*) here refers to a record of the proceedings upon which Simeon’s account, in the next chapter, may well be based. See Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 253–4, on the term.

134 Th. Lect. 483–4 (= Theoph. 154.3–11) reports the addition of this formula to the Trisagion in the liturgy by monks loyal to two leading opponents of Chalcedon, Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus, just before the deposition of Macedonius, cf. Athan. *Conflicts*, PO 4 (1907), 634. Frend 1979, 189, dates this development to the first half of 511, which is more plausible than 510, a date put forward by Winkelmann 1994, 100 and Daley 1995, 38. Extensive doctrinal discussions between Severus and Macedonius then ensued before the events related here, Athan. *Conflicts*, PO 4 (1907), 636–66, Zach. V. Sev. 109; see Frend 1979, 191–3, Daley 1995, 38–9. The Trisagion proclaimed ‘Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us’ to which the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch Peter the Fuller had appended ‘who was crucified for us’ c.470. For most Chalcedonians, the addition was unacceptable, as it implied that God the father had suffered on the cross (for which reason it was known as theopaschite); for opponents of the council, however, it swiftly became a rallying cry. See Frend 1972, 167–8, Brock 1985, 28–30, van Esbroeck 1996, 464–8, Blaudeau 2006a, 625–6, and esp. Menze 2008a, 165–75, Michelson 2008, 450–5. Chadwick 2001, 549 n.5, observes that the formula was differently interpreted at Antioch, where it was taken as referring just to Christ, whereas at Constantinople it was viewed as designating the whole Trinity, cf. Photius, cod.228 (ed. Henry, vol.4, p.115, from the writings of Ephraem, patriarch of Antioch, 527–45). See also Brock 2006, who translates a seventh-century Nestorian work critical of Anastasius’ attempts to introduce the formula ‘crucified for us’.

PZ’s claim that the additional formula went back to the time of patriarch Eustathius (324/6–330) is dismissed by Schwartz 1934, 242, although Blaudeau 2006a, 343 n.408, suggests that it might have been attempt to counter Arian views. In November 512 the introduction of the theopaschite formula in a service sparked a major uprising that forced Anastasius to back down; see Marc. *com.* a.512, Mal. 16.19, Th. Lect. 508–9, KG 65 with Croke 1995, 115 (who wrongly associates the account of Th. Lect. with 511 rather than 512, however), Meier 2007.

135 This section is written before the title of the following chapter in the MS in smaller script. We have followed Brooks’ emendation (PZT ii, 41) in reversing the order. Duchesne 1925, 24

To the excellent, elect, and God-loving priest and abbot Samuel, the priests, and the deacons with all the rest of the brotherhood, from the priest Simeon who is in the imperial city and the brothers who are with him, greetings. After we wrote the first letter to Your Holiness concerning everything that Macedonius had done in the monastery of Dalmatus against every truth, God stirred the spirit of the believing emperor:¹³⁶ like a lion after prey he roared and terrified every party of the enemies of the truth, for it is said, 'Like a stream of water in the hands of a gardener so is the heart of the king in the hands of the Lord.'¹³⁷ May He who did not ignore the prayer of his chosen ones and did not allow the desire of those who worship a human instead of God to come to pass grant that the matter receive a righteous conclusion through your prayers, yes and amen.¹³⁸

n.2, states that Simeon was a presbyter of Amida, cf. AK 345, citing a Simeon mentioned in Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 601–6, who spent ten years as a scribe in Constantinople (p.606). As Brooks notes, 606 n.1, however, John knew Simeon personally; the latter probably arrived in the capital therefore c.540. Hence he can hardly be identified as the Simeon referred to by PZ. Charanis 1974, 70 n.128, asserts without justification that Simeon was writing to a Samuel who was an archimandrite in Syria. Daley 1995, 39, curiously combines the two views, referring to a 'a Syrian presbyter, Simeon of Amida'. Capizzi 1969, 118 n.116, suggests that Simeon might be Simeon of Bet Arsham (on whom see viii.3a below), cf. Bacht 1953, 281 n.85. Given that PZ referred just above (vii.5e) to a monk Samuel – an apparently gratuitous reference – we may reasonably infer that it is to him that he is here referring.

136 Simeon takes up his account after Macedonius had given his declaration of faith to the emperor, passing over the third and fourth ecumenical councils and accepting the *Henoticon*, which had incurred the wrath of staunch Chalcedonians and caused them to secede from him. The patriarch sought then to repair the breach by his visit to the monastery of Dalmat(i)us, cf. Th. Lect. 488 (Theoph. 155.1–5) and below. It lay close to the church of St Stephen in the Aurelianae quarter of Constantinople, just outside the Constantinian walls; see Janin 1969, 82–4, Hatlie 2007, 91–3, and map 1 below. Nau 1909a, 8–9, 119–20, offers an interesting parallel case of a churchman in Constantinople writing to his superior, Martyrius of Antioch (459–71), to keep him abreast of developments there.

137 Proverbs 21.1.

138 PZ and Evagr. iii.31, giving the text of a letter from the monks of Palestine (129.15–24) claim that Macedonius performed a greater volte-face than (e.g.) Th. Lect. 487 (Theoph. 154.25–155.1) reports. PZ has the patriarch condemning Chalcedon outright, while Evagr.'s source states that he condemned those who divided the natures of Christ. See Whitby 2000a, 171 n.109 and Frend 1979, 191, who reject the scepticism of some modern scholars concerning Macedonius' volte-face, cf. Haarer 2006, 149 and n.143. But see Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009 (cf. Greatrex 2010), arguing that Macedonius had the upper hand. Probably Macedonius' willingness to omit mention of Chalcedon in his declaration was exploited by his enemies to make the further claim that he had actually condemned it, thus undermining his support. It is significant in this charged context that both sources to accuse Macedonius are contemporary letters. For recent discussions of these events see Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, Meier 2009, 264–7.

b. We make known to you that after Macedonius on the twentieth of July had done that concerning which we sent word to Your Piety and condemned those contemptible characters and the accursed council,¹³⁹ on Friday the twenty-second there was a dedication in the martyrion in the Hebdomon.¹⁴⁰ The emperor was there but neither he nor the empress accepted the oblation from him, but rather spoke harsh words to him. On Sunday the twenty-fourth the monks in this place entered and received communion in the church with Macedonius [42] and the emperor became annoyed by their entrance. On Monday the twenty-fifth some of the monks, a few brothers who had separated from them, entered and went to my lord the general Patricius, and gave him a *libellus* to take in to the emperor, saying, 'We declare that he made a commemoration for Nestorius, and he used to send a message to us that we also should do so in our monasteries every year.' They wrote other things against him, which were the activities that were being performed in their monasteries.¹⁴¹ That same day the emperor gave the order and the water that entered the baths was denied

139 PZ is the only source to offer such chronological precision; 20 July was a Wednesday in 511. Frend 1979, 192, postulates a debate between Severus and Macedonius on this day, cf. Bacht 1953, 281; this is explicitly rejected by Wickham 1973, 598. That the two did discuss theological points is clear, however, including the text of 1 Timothy 3.16 and John 19.34, see Lib. Brev. 19/134, Sev. Coll. ep. 108, PO 14 (1920), 266–7, with Frend 1979, 192–3. Whether it took place on this day, however, is unclear; more likely it occurred earlier in the year, so Haarer 2006, 149. Probably on the following day, the patriarch visited the monastery of Dalmatus to repair the damage done. See Grillmeier ii.1, 314–15/278. From Sev. Coll. ep. 118, PO 14 (1920), 290–1, revised in Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 246–52, it emerges that Macedonius prepared a document (*praxis*) at this point, in order to attest his orthodoxy and to bring into communion certain monasteries; this is likely to be the context in which he drew up this document. In consequence on Friday 22 July Anastasius and Ariadne refused to take communion from him.

140 Nothing further is known of this *martyrion*, although there was a church here containing the head of John the Baptist; the Hebdomon was the south-western section of the city. The imperial court often took up residence in this quarter of the city in the summer. See Janin 1964, 139, 446–9.

141 Evidently the monks rallied to Macedonius' support on Sunday 24 July, but already by the following day some preferred to switch allegiance to the emperor. Th. Lect. 489 (Theoph. 155.5–9) claims that Anastasius used bribery to obtain the allegations, cf. ACO iii, p.75.2, tr. in Vasiliev 1950, 142, where the people assembled in Hagia Sophia in 518 denounce those who bore false witness against the patriarch, with Hatlie 2007, 126. Further light is shed on these proceedings by Sev. Coll. ep. 118, PO 14 (1920), 290–1 (= Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 246–52), where Severus describes how Patricius criticised Macedonius for harking back to Chalcedon in a *praxis* (document) that he had circulated; the patrician Paul joined in the accusations, as did a bishop Julian, perhaps of Halicarnassus, who mentions that Macedonius had insisted that bishops whom he ordained subscribe to Chalcedon. Such were no doubt the allegations brought forward by the monks, as PZ describes.

to their monasteries, conceding to them only enough to drink. He also suspended the allowance that they received from the treasury.¹⁴²

c. On the twenty-sixth, a senator named Romanus¹⁴³ entered before the emperor, and he caused to be written against [Macedonius] everything that had been done in the episcopal household, and he said to the emperor that the deacon Pascasius had done all sorts of evil with Macedonius.¹⁴⁴ He also said that ‘He made a large book having in it [something] from every heresy, covered with gold.’ The emperor sent for it and took it for himself in order to see all of its blasphemies.¹⁴⁵

d. On the twenty-seventh the emperor assembled a council,¹⁴⁶ and when the patricians entered, the emperor said to them, ‘Do you not see what this Jew who is among us has done? For in my presence and in the presence of Your Excellencies he did what he did. He condemned the accursed Council and those contemptible characters, but when we accepted him, to avoid great trouble, he even went and returned to the monastery of Dalmatus and contradicted the entire truth, and lied in my presence to God and to you. Are these things correct?’ Immediately the patrician Clementinus said before all of them, ‘May God reject from his priesthood the one who lied to God.’ [43] At once the emperor commanded the chief prefect to go out into the city and assemble all of the orthodox who were beaten as they were crying out, ‘Who was crucified for us,’ and to learn who they were who were beating them.¹⁴⁷

142 Anastasius, having had to back down earlier in the year over the introduction of the extra formula to the Trisagion (Th. Lect. 486, Theoph. 154.21–2 with Haarer 2006, 147–8) tread carefully this time, only gradually increasing the pressure on Macedonius’ supporters in the capital. For the ‘allowance’ PZ uses the Greek term *diarion*, for which see Lampe 1961, 358.

143 Probably the *comes domesticorum* Romanus, who in 508 led an attack on Ostrogothic Italy. See *PLRE* ii, Romanus 8.

144 On Pascasius see n.132 above.

145 The sources refer to several such works in connection with Anastasius and Macedonius: see appendix 1.

146 On Wednesday 27 July Anastasius laid out his position at the *silentium*, a meeting of the leading nobles of the empire (also referred to as the *consistorium*) – not a ‘palace audience’, *contra* Daley 1995, 40. See Jones 1964, 338, cf. Blaudeau 2006a, 422 n.188, noting that the number of participants could vary. Clearly the author of this letter was not among those present at the meeting. We may presume that part of the aim of the meeting was to publicise the emperor’s position and to justify his actions; a summary may have been published to further this effort, and it was this (and/or oral sources) that Simeon used as a source for his letter.

147 On Clementinus, see *PLRE* ii, Clementinus. He is attested as a supporter of Severus in Zach. V. Sev. 104. The ‘chief prefect’ could refer to the praetorian prefect, perhaps Zoticus (see *PLRE* ii, Zoticus) but Meier 2007, 188–90, plausibly prefers an identification with the city prefect Plato (*PLRE* ii, Plato 3), a hard-line supporter of the emperor.

e. The prefect went out and did as he was commanded. On the twenty-eighth he took the names of all of those Nestorians who were the soul of Macedonius, and he brought them in to the emperor, and the emperor commanded them to be arrested.

f. On the twenty-ninth the emperor assembled all of the commanders of the armed forces, all of the heads of the *scholarii* and the patricians and said to them, 'As is customary for me, I intend to give a donative,' for he used to do so ever since he became emperor, giving it out once every five years, while requiring oaths from all who were Roman soldiers that they would not plot against the empire.¹⁴⁸ This time, he required them to swear in the following manner. With a copy of the gospel-book in place, they entered and received five *denarii* each, swearing the following: 'By this law of God and these words that were written in it we will fight with all of our might on behalf of the true faith and for the empire, and [we swear] that we will plot neither against the truth nor against the emperor.' He required them to swear in this manner because he had heard that Macedonius was attempting to raise a rebellion against him.¹⁴⁹

g. On July the thirtieth the emperor granted a bounty to the whole army. On the same day the priests and deacons who had separated from the clergy [of Macedonius] so as not to participate in his iniquity gave a *libellus* against Macedonius to the emperor, informing against him that in addition

148 In this period, emperors were in the habit of offering donatives to their troops every five years, thereby bolstering their loyalty: see Jones 1964, 624 and cf. Proc. *Anecd.* 24.27–8. The amount generally paid was five *solidi* (*denarii* here, staters in Proc.). The reference here is therefore most likely to the slightly delayed donative to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of Anastasius' accession. The emperor was not requiring that the *scholarii* adopt his christological position, merely that they remain loyal to him; greater tolerance was usually accorded to soldiers, to the extent that Arians continued to serve right up to the reign of Justinian. See Greatrex 2001a, esp. 79. Proc. *Anecd.* 24.28–9 recounts how messengers were sent throughout the empire to distribute the donative to soldiers outside the capital.

149 Mich. Syr. ix.9 (262c/164), who is here following PZ or, less plausibly, drawing on an independent copy of Simeon's letter, adds that Anastasius had learnt that Macedonius intended to raise a revolt through Vitalian, his nephew. The extra information is important, since it serves to explain the great caution exercised by the emperor and in particular the donatives given to the troops on 29 and 30 July. Vitalian was at this time *magister militum per Illyricum* and known to be a vigorous supporter of Chalcedon; in 513 or 514 he led an uprising against the emperor. See Greatrex 1996a, 126 n.15 on the date, cf. *PLRE* ii, Vitalianus 2. No other source reports this relationship and it must be treated with caution; however, PZ is also the only source to report the ill-treatment of Vitalian's wife by Hypatius (vii.13c), and in general appears very well informed about him. Brooks, PZV ii, 30 n.1, suggests that Mich. Syr.'s source was Joh. Eph. rather than PZ, which is possible, albeit unlikely, since he here follows PZ very closely.

to all his wickedness he had called his Majesty a Manichaeon as well as a Eutychian.¹⁵⁰

h. On Sunday July the thirty-first [44] they entered with great fear and found the emperor full of rage and agitated.¹⁵¹ When everyone had waited a long time and each person was considering in fear what was going to be commanded by him, he opened his mouth and began to speak as follows. ‘Do you not know that from my youth I was raised in the faith? Do any of you see in me something that is other than the truth?’ They said ‘By no means, my Lord.’ He then said to them, ‘Because Macedonius called me a Manichaeon and a Eutychian, I defend myself before God, the judge of all, that I have not been of an opinion nor am I of an opinion that is other than that of the 318 holy fathers and of the 150 [fathers]. I confess that one of the persons of the Trinity, God the Word, came down from heaven, and was embodied from the birthgiver of God Mary who is ever virgin, and he was crucified for us, suffered, died, and rose on the third day according to his will; he is the judge of the dead and of the living. I adjure you by the holy Trinity that if you know anything in me other than this, or if you are not convinced by anything that I have said, then take off from me this cloak and this crown, and burn me in the middle of this city.’¹⁵²

i. While he was saying these things there was great weeping and all of the patricians threw themselves down before him. General Patricius said, ‘In the case of someone who has done these things neither will God forgive him nor will the empire nor the canons of the church have mercy on him.’¹⁵³ The emperor said, ‘Then everyone who goes to confer with Macedonius or communicates with him is a stranger to my empire.’ Then while they were present before him he spoke against the *magister officiorum*, saying,

150 See n.129 above on these accusations.

151 PZ is referring to the leading nobles in Constantinople. Mich. Syr. ix.9 (262c/164) adds that the holding of a *silentium* (the term he uses) on a Sunday was unprecedented.

152 Anastasius’ declaration of his orthodoxy asserts his acceptance of the first two ecumenical councils. Cf. the emperor’s *typos*, tr. in Grillmeier ii.1, 311–12/275 with n.158 below. The rest of his statement, stressing that one of the Trinity suffered on the cross, is theopaschite, recalling the formula added to the Trisagion, see n.134 above. In 519 Scythian monks at Rome argued in favour of this very interpretation, seeing in it a means to defend Chalcedon against accusations of Nestorianism: see Gray 1979, 48–9, Menze 2008, 39–42. The emperor’s offer to resign was a remarkably successful tactic, employed equally after rioting in the capital in 512: see Stein 1949, 177–8, Meier 2007, 171–2, 223–4.

153 Patricius, who had held the consulship in 500, was currently *magister militum praesentalis*. Despite his backing for Anastasius on this occasion, he later helped enforce allegiance to Chalcedon; see PZ viii n.53 below on his role in this case. See PLRE ii, Patricius 14 with Greatrex 1996a, 125–6, Meier 2007, 193–5.

'Is not the wealth and the honour that God has given us not sufficient that we should take [45] a bribe in the matter of the lives of all persons, and also destroy our own lives?' speaking and looking in the direction of the *magister officiorum* who had inflicted many evils on the faithful. But our Lord rewarded him according to his deeds because he is the judge of the living and of the dead.¹⁵⁴ On the same day the emperor positioned Romans¹⁵⁵ at the gates of the city and at the harbours, so that none of the monks who were here could enter the city.¹⁵⁶

j. On the first of August the deacon Pascasius was arrested. He came before the prefect and he confessed concerning all that had been done in the episcopal residence, saying also that Macedonius had sought to make a rebellion against the emperor. The next day the Nestorians were arrested, and they confessed that they had some forged books of this heresy. The prefect sent for them, had them brought to the *praetorium*,¹⁵⁷ and showed them to the emperor and to the senators.

k. On the sixth of the month there was a meeting of the council, and the orthodox and the Nestorians who mounted a defence on behalf of Macedonius entered before him. They found the emperor present, because the bishops belonging to our party had entered.¹⁵⁸ The emperor said to the

154 On the role of Celer, the *magister officiorum*, see n.130 above. The reference to some sort of punishment is puzzling. Celer was later involved in asking Severus to reinstate two Chalcedonian bishops of Syria II he had deposed (Sev. *Lett.* i.24, cf. i.21); he also played a leading part in ensuring the accession of Justin I and was involved in negotiations with the papacy around the same time. Since these events took place later in the same decade, this comment may be a later insertion. The reference to Celer's reward might be to the fact that he suffered from gout. See Greatrex 1996a, 126–7, Meier 2007, 192.

155 The use of the term 'Romans' for soldiers is normal for PZ, although it might in this case reflect the original letter (in Syriac?). See further PZ iii n.91.

156 Disorderly monks could seriously imperil an emperor's position, as Basiliscus had discovered to his cost, see v.5a above. The walls here referred to are probably those of Constantine, not Theodosius, if not both: all of the Chalcedonian monasteries which were active at the time were situated beyond the walls of Constantine. See Janin 1969, 97–9 on the monastery of Dios, 60–1 on that of Bassianus, 329 on that of Matrona and above nn.136 and 124 on those of Dalmatus and the Akoimetai (on the other side of the Bosphorus). Cf. Greatrex 2001a, 74 and n.12 for toleration of Arian churches in the same area.

157 There were three *praetoria* (headquarters) of prefects in Constantinople: see Mango 1993, Addenda, 1–2, cf. Dagron 1974, 239. Most probably the reference is to that of the city prefect (mentioned above, n.147) situated on the Mesê. See also Greatrex 1997, 84 and map.

158 The final showdown between Macedonius' emissaries and Anastasius took place on Saturday 6 August 511. PZ uses the Greek (in fact, Latin) terms *silentium conventum* for the meeting, cf. n.146 on the former term. On Macedonius' book see vii.7b above. The emperor's explicit condemnation of Chalcedon – if Simeon's account can be relied upon, which may

clergy of Macedonius, ‘Why have you come?’ They said, ‘If Your Majesty commands, Your servant will come to Your Clemency.’ He said, ‘Let him go to those in whose presence he preached his wickedness and who obeyed him. For at one time he had a book that he decorated and was saying that it was of the [church] fathers and that they taught two natures after the incarnation. I said to him, “You have no use for these things, go and burn it.”’ And he [Anastasius] said to the clergy, ‘What are the two natures and the Council of Chalcedon that God blotted out from its foundations? I declare to you that you are accursed Jews, [46] among you there is no one who fears God, who is hurt concerning what has been done in his church.’ And they went out from his presence in great fear and distress, and the orthodox praised him greatly. When the clergy went to Macedonius and said to him, ‘The lord of the world¹⁵⁹ has condemned in the presence of the senators the Council of Chalcedon and all who say “two natures,”’ he said to them, ‘I condemn all who do not accept the Council and [do not] say “two natures.”’ His archdeacon cried out, ‘Far be it from us that we should have any portion or communion with you ever again!’¹⁶⁰

I. On Sunday the seventh of the month the faithful prepared and entered the church and it was filled from one side to the other. When the Apostle

be doubted – shows a hardening of the imperial stance since the time of Zeno’s *Henoticon*, which merely omitted reference to the council. Such a development can be attributed to the influence of Severus during his stay in Constantinople from 508 to 511 and linked to the *typos* issued by the emperor at this time. This document accepts the first three ecumenical councils, explicitly rejects the formula ‘two natures’, and anathematises Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo. See Moeller 1961, 240–7, Frend 1972, 217 and n.4, Haarer 2006, 146–7; Grillmeier ii.1, 311–12/275 offers a translation of the *typos*, cf. Haarer 2006, 280–1. De Halleux 1963, 68 and n.32, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 314/278 and Gray 1979, 39–40, doubts whether Anastasius would have been so outspoken in condemning Chalcedon at this point and prefers to date the *typos* to the period when Severus was patriarch of Antioch (512–18). Daley 1995, 37, assumes that the *typos* dates from 509/10, cf. Haarer 2006, 146 (510/11), Meier 2007, 219 n.306, idem 2009, 258–9.

159 Syr. *mārêh d’âlmâ*, used three times in close succession, cf. Gk. *tôn holôn kratôn*, referring to Anastasius, in an inscription from Euchaïta, commemorating the emperor’s promotion of the city to become the seat of a bishop: see Mango and Ševčenko 1972, 380–1.

160 Throughout this account, PZ’s source is keen to emphasise the support of the people and the clergy for the emperor. Sources such as Th. Lect. 492 (Theoph. 155.22–4) make it quite clear, however, that the patriarch retained great support throughout the city and that his removal by night was to prevent a riot against the emperor. The same source (Th. Lect. 490, Theoph. 155.9–17) report that Macedonius had to be removed from his residence by force and that many clergy were imprisoned or fled. The riots which broke out in November 512 offer further proof of the general opposition to Anastasius’ anti-Chalcedonian line. See Frend 1972, 220, Haarer 2006, 151, Meier 2007, 214–26. The ‘portion’ referred to probably refers to the eucharistic bread, the Gk. *meris* (cf. Lampe 1961, 843).

had been read,¹⁶¹ from the back the people began to cry out, 'Let him who reduces the Trinity not enter the church! Let him who blasphemes against the Son of God not come in here! No one wants a Jewish bishop! Where Nestorius went, let also his disciples go! Many years to the king, a second Constantine, for the upholder of the faith! The Gospel Book to the throne!' And at that moment the clergy took the Gospel Book and placed it on the throne. When the clergy of the entire church saw [the people] crying out, they also cried out and showed themselves, waving their *oraria*¹⁶² and saying, 'The victorious emperor has won a victory for our church!' When they had stopped, the chief prefect made a public address as follows.¹⁶³

m. 'We accept your good will and your zeal on behalf of the truth; you know the lord of the world has great concern for the sake of the establishment of orthodoxy, and for the peace of all of the churches, and we will bring to his attention your voices on behalf of the [47] true faith.' When the deacon had read the litany, the mysteries were performed without mentioning his name and without calling it out at the diptychs.¹⁶⁴

n. Just as our Lord willed that he depart, the emperor commanded and his exile took place. In order to humiliate the *magister officiorum* he sent him to expel [Macedonius]. He found him after he had fled to a church, sitting with his head placed between his knees, and said to him, 'The lord of the world has exiled you.' Macedonius said, 'To where?' The *magister officiorum* said, 'To where your friend went.'¹⁶⁵ The stewards [of the church]

161 A reference to a reading from St Paul's works, see Brightman 1896, 570, cf. 314 for the position of the reading in the service.

162 Gk. *ōraron*, Lat. *orarium*, defined by Lampe 1961, 1557, as a 'deacon's stole – a narrow strip of embroidered silk (originally linen) worn by the deacon when officiating.'

163 PZ describes a remarkable scene played out in the church, presumably Hagia Sophia. The acclamations made are the complete opposite of those cried out only seven years later, upon the accession of Justin I, when the people demanded that the patriarch celebrate mass in honour of the fathers of Chalcedon, *ACO* ii, p.74, tr. Vasiliev 1950, 141. It appears that the clergy demonstrated their support for the emperor only once they perceived the strength of popular opinion. On the 'chief prefect' see n.147 above.

164 The proclamation probably refers to the moment at which, during the intercession, the celebrant was supposed to mention the patriarchs; the diptychs were read a little later. See Brightman 1896, 331, 336 (the ninth-century liturgies of Saints Basil and John Chrysostom). The diptychs gave a list of names of those for whom prayers were offered during the service, see Whitby 2000a, 328. The omission of Macedonius in both cases was an indication that he was no longer recognised as patriarch.

165 Macedonius was banished to Euchaïta in Pontus, the same place to which his predecessor, Euphemius, had been sent. This is presumably what Simeon had in mind here, but PZ (vii.7b, cf. n.131 above) interpreted it as a reference to Nestorius, whose colleague

said to him, 'We beg Your Authority to have mercy on his old age; let him not leave during the daytime but in the evening so that [the people of] the city not strike him and stone him.' When they promised to guard him, [the *magister officiorum*] departed and left a detachment with them. They said to him, 'The emperor has ordered you to hand over that book of the Council (of Chalcedon) that you have.' He said, 'I will not give it to him,' but under pressure he placed it on the table and the clergy brought it to the *magistrarianus* and gave it to the emperor.¹⁶⁶ At evening on the seventh of the month the *magister officiorum* and an armed guard came, brought him out, and handed him over to those who had been appointed to transport him,¹⁶⁷ and all of the orthodox were very afraid.¹⁶⁸ These are the events that in truth, my lord, we have made known to Your Holiness, and we will inform you

Macedonius was accused of being and who was banished to Oasis in 435: see Frend 1972, 24. Followers of Macedonius were also later exiled to Oasis, Theoph. 157.23. PD ii, 9/10, repeats PZ's account: see Witakowski 1991, 257.

166 The document that Anastasius wanted was the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon, rather than his own declaration of faith which he had presented to Euphemius at the start of his reign. See Th. Lect. 491 (Theoph. 155.17–21) with Croke 1995, 114. The latter had in any case already been recovered by Anastasius before Euphemius' downfall, Th. Lect. 447 (Theoph. 139.19–20), cf. Charanis 1974, 56. According to Th. Lect., *loc. cit.*, it was actually stolen from Hagia Sophia by a certain Calopodius, an *oikonomos* of the church. See Haarer 2006, 149 and n.144, Grillmeier ii.1, 315 n.158/279 n.158. An alternative tradition recounted that Anastasius recovered the acts of Chalcedon by opening up the coffin of the martyr Euphemia; he then burned the records. See *Chr. Ede.* 83, Jac. Ede. *Chr.* 179, Mich. Syr. ix.8 (260c/160–1). Euphemia's coffin lay in the church of her name at Chalcedon, described at length by Evagr. ii.3 (cf. Whitby 2000a, 62–4 for commentary) and she was associated with the council right from the start (see Karlin-Hayter 1995, 405); this association probably lies behind this alternative tradition. Schwartz 1934, 243 n.3, rejects both of these versions, arguing instead that Anastasius gained possession of the florilegium that Macedonius had compiled. The term *magistrarianus* refers to an official in the bureau of the *magister officiorum*.

167 On the evening of Sunday 7 August Celer removed Macedonius from the city. Evagr. iii.32 claims that he advised the patriarch to withdraw, but it is far more likely, given Macedonius' enduring popularity, that troops were involved, as PZ relates. Before Macedonius reached Euchaita, his place of exile, he was deposed by a synod at Claudiopolis, where he was not even present to defend himself. See Th. Lect. 496 (Theoph. 155.30–156.9) with Charanis 1974, 70–1. On the accusations brought against him see Duchesne 1925, 24–5, Frend 1972, 218, Haarer 2006, 151 n.154.

168 The text here in PZT is odd, since it implies that the anti-Chalcedonians were in great fear after the expulsion of Macedonius, which was the outcome they had desired. PD ii, 9/10–11, translated by Witakowski 1996a, 11 (cf. n.74) gives 'And he [i.e. Macedonius] had caused great trouble in the whole church of the orthodox', preferring a variant reading noted by HB 176 n.5. This makes better sense, but PD's text here remains problematic, and indeed part of it has even been restored from PZ.

concerning anything further that our Lord does. Pray for us, chosen one of God.'

o. The previous defence of the emperor indicates to us that when Philoxenus the believing teacher and bishop of Mabbugh, who was a zealous man, had learned that Macedonius was a heretic, he stated in writing the true faith to the emperor, as he had also done in the time of Zeno; and it was read before the senators, and he showed that opinions opposed to it were held by the school of Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius who was driven out because he was their disciple, and by Theodoret, Hiba, Andrew, John, and Aetheric, [48] who had set up the Council of Chalcedon and accepted the Tome, and sundered the unity of God the Word, who became embodied, in two natures and their properties, which they taught concerning the Messiah after he became embodied. Philoxenus urged the emperor, 'It is right that they should be condemned by those who declare themselves to be orthodox, and agree with the faith of Your Majesty.' When Macedonius was required to do this, he condemned them under compulsion, while commemorating them afterward covertly in the monastery of Dalmatus as was written above.¹⁶⁹

a. The ninth chapter of the seventh book gives information concerning Timothy who was [bishop] after Macedonius and how 'who was crucified for us' was proclaimed in the time of the Emperor Anastasius in the imperial city.

¹⁶⁹ This final paragraph represents the inferences drawn by PZ on the basis of the letter he quotes. He is correct in assigning a significant role to Philoxenus, who was in Constantinople in 507. It was at a synod held there in 507 that he issued his statement of faith, cf. Maraval 1998b, 126, de Halleux 1963, 61–3, Frend 1972, 216, Grillmeier ii.1, 270–1/305–6, Haarer 2006, 141–3, Meier 2009, 255. De Halleux 62 n.78, cf. Grillmeier 305/270 n.122, argues that PZ's *synklêtos*, a word that would usually be translated as 'Senate', here describes rather the *synodos endêmousa*, i.e. the meeting in 507 of the local synod of Constantinople. On Philoxenus' earlier statement of faith, under Zeno, see de Halleux 1963, 37–8, 171–3; the text may be found in Vaschalde 1902, 163–73/118–26, 90–2. Evagr. iii.31 confirms the demand made of Macedonius for an explicit statement of faith, discussed above n.138. The individuals referred to are Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Hiba (Ibas) of Edessa, Andrew of Samosata, John of Germanicia (or possibly of Aegae) and Eutheries of Tyana. Rammelt 2008, 245, argues that their common denominator is their membership of the 'Antiochene school'. A comparable list is given by Vict. Ton. 81, (a.499 = Th. Lect. KG 54), describing a synod held in 499 which is usually identified with that held in Constantinople in 507; see Abramowski 1965b. Severus condemned the same individuals in his address to the archimandrites and monks of the East: see Kugener 1904, 323–4. Cf. the list in the letter of Anthimus given by PZ at ix.21c and the comments in AK 346, Whitby 2000a, 169 n.102.

Timothy became bishop in Constantinople after Macedonius. He was a believing man, and his deeds were consistent with his name, which means ‘one who honours God.’¹⁷⁰ In his time there was someone [named] Marinus from Apamea, a conscientious and clever man who was skilled in business, wise and learned, and moreover a true believer, the emperor’s friend and confidant, *chartularius*, and his adviser. Whenever he was walking in the street or sitting somewhere, whatever he was thinking, he would recount to the secretaries to summarise what he was saying. Even at night he used to hang at his bed a writing stand, and with the lamp lighting his pillows he [49] would write his thoughts on paper, and the next day inform the emperor and advise him what he should do.¹⁷¹ Since he was from the district of Antioch, which since the time of bishop Eustathius was so entirely diligent that it was the first to proclaim ‘who was crucified for us,’ he too stridently urged on Emperor Anastasius, advising him to do likewise.¹⁷² When some of the heretics learned of [Marinus’] accomplishment, they assembled against him and said to him, ‘You want and urge that earthly humans go beyond the holy praise of the angels who are close to the Trinity and say “Holy, holy, holy Lord of hosts, heaven and earth are filled with your glory.”’ Immediately God the Word who was crucified in the flesh for us humans prepared a defence in his own mouth to the effect that ‘It is appropriate that the angels give the praise of their confession of the worshipful Trinity, equal in nature, and do not proclaim that he was crucified for them. But for us it is appropriate to say ‘who was crucified for us’ in the praise of our confession because he became

170 Although some may have hoped for the elevation of Severus to the patriarchate, Anastasius chose instead Timothy, a presbyter and sacristan of Hagia Sophia, ‘also called Dirty Glutton and Stallion because of some activities that fit these names’ (Th. Lect. 492, Theoph. 155.25–6, tr. Mango and Scott 1997, 236). Unlike Macedonius, he was prepared to communicate with John Nicaïotes, patriarch of Alexandria. Nonetheless John failed to reciprocate, viewing the new patriarch as insufficiently vigorous in his opposition to Chalcedon; Anastasius then wrote to John himself, insisting that he communicate with Timothy. See Lebon 1909, 50–1, Haarer 2006, 152.

171 On Marinus see *PLRE* ii, Marinus, Meier 2007, 182–8. He was a *chartularius* in the bureau of the praetorian prefect at Constantinople, rising to the post of praetorian prefect in c.512; he was also a correspondent of Severus. Like the later praetorian prefect John the Cappadocian, his skill and innovation were as much appreciated by the emperor as they were disliked by contemporaries: Joh. Lyd. *De Mag.* iii.36, 46, 49 is particularly critical. Mal. 16.19, cf. Marc. *com.* a.512.2 and other sources noted in *PLRE*, reports the burning of his house by rioters who attributed to him (as PZ does) Anastasius’ introduction of the extra formula into the Trisagion.

172 On the doubtful attribution of the Trisagion to Eustathius, patriarch of Antioch, and the formula in general see n.134 above.

embodied from us, but did not take on the [nature] of the angels.’¹⁷³ So he reduced them to silence and informed the emperor, and he commanded that ‘who was crucified for us’ should be proclaimed in the imperial city as it was in the district of Antioch. Contemporaneously there occurred at that time a miraculous sign for the edification of those who understand that the Messiah is God, who was crucified in the flesh in Jerusalem: an eclipse of the sun brought darkness from the sixth hour until the ninth.¹⁷⁴

a. [50] The tenth chapter of the seventh book provides information concerning the council that took place in Sidon in the fifth year, which was the year 823 of the Greeks, and year 560 of the era of Antioch.¹⁷⁵

In the time of Zeno, Philoxenus the eloquent Syrian doctor who was zealous for the faith and was bishop of Mabbugh wrote and sent a confession of faith and sought from Zeno [a statement] concerning his faith, and he received a reply, and it was he who exposed Calendon of Antioch and had him deposed from his see. He also suspected that Flavian was a heretic, and he wrote and sent exhortations to the Emperor Anastasius, pleading with him that a council should take place in Sidon.¹⁷⁶

b. Anastasius gave the order and it was assembled in the year 560 of the era of the Antioch.¹⁷⁷ And he prompted the faithful and zealous monks of the

173 The criticism and defence of the addition to the Trisagion are reported in very similar terms in Joh. Nik. 89.54, 56, where the defence is attributed to Severus and some further argumentation added. Meier 2007, 179–80, suggests a link between Joh. Nik. and PZ (cf. Mich. Syr. ix.7 [257–8c/155–6]). See Menze 2008a, 170–1, on the defence: as he notes, there was little support to be found for the addition among the church fathers.

174 A solar eclipse was visible in Constantinople on 29 June 512, see Marc. *com.* a.512.10, Joh. Lyd. *De ost.* 6 (p.11) with Croke 1995, 117.

175 The fifth year refers to the fifth indiction year, i.e. 511/12, as is AG 823; likewise 560 by the calendar of Antioch is 511/12, cf. Grumel 1958, 244.

176 On Philoxenus (Akhsenaya in Syriac) see n.208 below. Peter the Fuller, patriarch of Antioch, consecrated him bishop of Hierapolis (Mabbugh in Syriac) in 485, see de Halleux 1963, 39–41. He had visited Constantinople in the previous year in order to bring pressure to bear for the expulsion of patriarch Calendon of Antioch: see de Halleux 1963, 37–8, Frend 1972, 188 n.3, Maraval 1998b, 118–20 with PZ v.5b and n.83.

177 The synod of Sidon took place in October 511 or 512: both dates are to be found in the sources, see Charanis 1974, 73 n.40, Haarer 2006, 152 and n.164. PZ very clearly indicates the former date by his three chronological indicators (*contra* Duchesne 1925, 27 n.2, who states that PZ’s dates are the equivalent of 510–11). This date should therefore be preferred, cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 316–17/279, Allen and Hayward 2004, 9. Philoxenus, upon returning to Syria from Constantinople c.508, had consistently sought to remove Flavian. A synod in Antioch in 509 held by the patriarch thwarted Philoxenus’ efforts, however, by approving the *Henoticon*, omitting reference to Chalcedon, and condemning various dyophysite luminaries, such as

East, and a certain eloquent Cosmas from the monastery of my lord ‘Aqiba of Qenneshrin (Chalcis), who was residing in Antioch, and they made a petition and presented it to Flavian and to the assembly of the bishops who were with him in Sidon. They composed their objections intelligently and precisely in seventy-seven points with many citations from the holy teachers to confirm the censure against the synod of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo.¹⁷⁸ They presented it to the synod while urging and admonishing the priests to make reforms, to lift the stumbling blocks from the paths of the church, and clearly and openly to condemn the council. Flavian, who was the head of the priests, and some of those priests who were with him put the matter aside, saying, ‘We are content with a document that condemns the writings of the school of Diodore, the objections of certain individuals to [51] the twelve chapters of Cyril, and Nestorius, so that we not wake the sleeping dragon and corrupt many with its poison,’ and on this note the synod was dissolved.

c. The zeal of Philoxenus incited the monks again and they went up to Anastasius and informed him concerning what had taken place at the synod,

Diodore and Theodore, whose views were unacceptable to anti-Chalcedonians; Flavian even bowed to anti-Chalcedonian pressure and condemned the phrase ‘in two natures’. See Theoph. 151.15–18 with de Halleux 1962, 56–9, idem 1963, 50–9, 64–6, Grillmeier ii.1, 306–9/271–3, Allen and Hayward 2004, 9, Haarer 2006, 145–6. Yet Philoxenus continued to push Flavian to be more explicit in his condemnation of Chalcedon, eventually inducing him to condemn Chalcedon itself. See Evagr. iii.31 for a detailed account, cf. Theoph. 153.12–154.2 (Th. Lect. 497) with Cyr. Scyth. V. *Sab.* 56 (148–9), de Halleux 1962, 58 and n.179 below.

Whether Philoxenus or Flavian summoned the synod at Sidon is uncertain: PZ, like Theoph. 153.12–13 and Marc. *com.* a.512, cf. Mich. Syr. ix.10 (261c/162), implies that the former persuaded the emperor to call it. But Philoxenus’ own works, notably frg.4 of the *Letter to Simeon*, 179–80/190 (with Lebon 1930, 169–70), tend to support the opposing view, since by his own admission he and his supporters were heavily outnumbered at the synod; Severus too refers to the setback suffered by the (hardline) anti-Chalcedonian cause at the synod (*Lett.* iv.2, 289/255–6). The Chalcedonian *Melkite Chronicle* 13 (= de Halleux 1975/6, 256) preserves a different tradition, according to which Anastasius himself instigated the synod in order to reconcile Philoxenus and Flavian. Despite the petition prepared by Cosmas, which may be referred to by Sev. *Lett.* vi.1, 407/361 (see de Halleux 1963, 72 and n.59), Flavian and his supporters were able to counter with numerous other documents, which clearly proved that earlier opponents of Chalcedon had been satisfied with declarations of the sort he had already issued. Hence the moderate line triumphed and Philoxenus was forced to resort to other means to oust Flavian. For details see Lebon 1909, 41–2, 51–4, Charanis 1974, 72–6, de Halleux 1963, 71–3, Grillmeier ii.1, 316–17/279–81, Haarer 2006, 145–6, 153–4.

178 Mich. Syr. ix.10 (263c/165) refers the reader at the end of the chapter to a summary of the 77 chapters which he gives in viii; the only refutations of Chalcedon to be found in Mich. Syr. viii, however, are at viii.13, where selections from a work of John Philoponus are given. Cosmas’ compilation is referred to also at iv.6d and below in the heading of vii.11. On the monastery of Mar ‘Aqiba, see PZ viii n.104.

and concerning Flavian who was a heretic. When they had received the command that [Flavian] was to be deposed they went back to the East and assembled in Antioch against him. Some of them were beaten and some of them were killed; nevertheless Flavian was driven from his see.¹⁷⁹

d. After him, Severus became bishop.¹⁸⁰ He was a monk and a skilled orator from the monastery of Theodore the Apodikanikon¹⁸¹ in Gaza and was

¹⁷⁹ Anastasius was understandably dissatisfied with the outcome of the synod. Flavian and Elias were called upon by the emperor's envoy to the council, the tribune Eutropius (*PLRE* ii, Eutropius 4), to comply with the emperor's wishes. Flavian wrote to him, indicating his support for the first three ecumenical councils and for the *Henoticon*, but omitting reference to Chalcedon; Elias was persuaded, it seems, to condemn Chalcedon. See Th. Lect. 497 (Theoph. 153.15–154.2), Evagr. iii.31, *Syn. Vet.* 112, with Charanis 1974, 75–6, and de Halleux 1963, 67–8. This was insufficient, however, and Flavian was finally obliged to condemn Chalcedon. Even then his opponents were not satisfied, regarding his condemnation as insincere, and Philoxenus, having secured Anastasius' approval, moved at last to remove him. A synod of Philoxenus' supporters at Laodicea effected the deposition of Flavian. Then, with monks from Syria I, Philoxenus descended on Antioch; disturbances ensued when the local population took the patriarch's side, and the situation deteriorated further when Chalcedonian monks from Syria II assembled in the city to lend Flavian their support. Imperial officials insisted the patriarch withdraw for the sake of order, and he was swiftly banished then to Petra, along with other clergy who had backed him. See Th. Lect. 498 (Theoph. 156.9–19), Evagr. iii.32, *Syn. Vet.* 113 with de Halleux 1963, 73–5, Frend 1972, 219, Grillmeier ii.3, 306, Whitby 2000a, 174–5. Haarer 2006, 154–5, 160–2, Greatrex 2007b, 285–7.

¹⁸⁰ Severus is generally said to have been ordained patriarch on 6 November 512; so (e.g.) Frend 1972, 219. Peeters 1944, 258–9, argued for Sunday 18 November, however, noting that the date of 6 November depends on Malalas alone, cf. Engberding 1953, 133. Allen and Hayward 2004, 12, following Brière 1960, 13–14, place his election on 6 November and his consecration ten days later, cf. Meier 2007, 186 n.138; he then repeated the homily he had given in the Great Church of Antioch on Friday 16 November at the shrine of St Romanus on Sunday 18 November. On Severus' numerous works, noted and praised here by PZ, see AK 349–50, Lebon 1909, 118–75, Allen and Hayward 2004, 39–55. Born c.456, he studied in his youth at Alexandria and Berytus before receiving baptism in 488. He then spent some time at the monastery of Peter the Iberian, then at that of Romanus near Eleutheropolis before moving back to the coast at Maiuma, the port of Gaza. The monastery to which PZ here refers must be that of Peter the Iberian, which by the time of Severus' stay (the mid-490s) was administered by the Theodore to whom he refers. See Zach. *V. Sev.* 95–6 on the monastery of Peter, *ibid.* 106–7 on Theodore himself (who visited Constantinople with Severus in 508). See Frend 1972, 201–14, Allen and Hayward 2004, 3–24, and our Introduction B (1) on Severus generally.

¹⁸¹ The identity of Theodore is unclear: AK 348–9 argue that PZ is referring to Theodore of Ascelon, a schoolfriend of Severus and later head of the monastery of Peter the Iberian in Gaza; he is attested as a law student in Zach. *V. Sev.* 86–7, which would fit with the term *apodikanikon*, i.e. former lawyer, and *Vit. Petr. Iber.* 112/81 likewise refers to him as *apocholastikos*. Cf. Horn 2006, 214 n.517, also 212–14 on the monastery itself with PZ v.9b and n.140. The allusion might (less plausibly) be to the monastery of Romanus, whose abbot

an *apocrisarius* in the imperial city. He was known and beloved by Probus and his associates;¹⁸² having earlier written the *Philalêthês*, he had also made a refutation of the *Seven Questions of the Dyophysites*¹⁸³ and readily disputed with heretics.¹⁸⁴ He was introduced to the emperor through Probus and was appointed archbishop of Antioch. Subsequently, he convened a synod in Tyre with Philoxenus and the priests of his jurisdiction, and those of Phoenice Libanensis, Arabia, Euphratesia, and Mesopotamia, and he interpreted the *Henoticon* of Zeno, showing how it negates the council of Chalcedon, and the bishops who were assembled there in Tyre condemned the council of Chalcedon and the Tome openly.¹⁸⁵ They wrote to John of Alexandria and to Timothy of the imperial city and they received from them replies, and from Elias of Jerusalem, who was subsequently deposed and after whom

was called Theodore, who rescued Severus when he fell ill through excessive asceticism, Zach. V. Sev. 96–7, Allen and Hayward 2004, 7, 26–7.

182 He was in the capital from 508 to 511 (see e.g. Allen and Hayward 2004, 8), and there is no reason to suppose that he did not then build up a friendship with Probus, the youngest nephew of Anastasius, who remained a consistent supporter of the anti-Chalcedonian cause even under Justinian. See *PLRE* ii, Probus 8 and Greatrex 1996a, 129.

183 On the *Philalêthês* see Allen and Hayward 2004, 41–2. Kugener 1900b, 467, 478, considers the latter work to be a letter of Severus to the *cubicularius* Eupraxius (Zach.'s dedicatee), answering seven questions he had put to him, cf. Krüger 1906, 254.23–9 and Zach. V. Sev. 106.

184 We follow Kugener 1904, 270 and n.1 in interpreting these statements as referring to Severus rather than Theodore; Lib. *Brev.* 19/134 (p.133.16), confirms that he was sent to Constantinople as an *apocrisarius*, although this is seldom noticed in recent biographies. During Severus' patriarchate his brother Peter acted as his *apocrisarius* in the imperial capital: see Honigsmann 1951, 22.

185 PD ii, 13–14/15 offers an account derived from PZ's here but claims wrongly that representatives of all the patriarchates (including Rome) were present: see Lebon 1909, 63, Witakowski 1991, 258 (less certain). Severus' elevation restored communion between Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria, but many eastern provinces, as well as Elias, patriarch of Jerusalem, refused to accept him. See Frend 1972, 223–5, Haarer 2006, 157–9. There followed two synods to shore up Severus' position, one at Antioch in 513 and the other at Tyre in 514 or 515. No source reports both synods, however: PZ and accounts derived from his describe only the latter, while the contemporary witnesses Severus and Philoxenus refer only to the former. As de Halleux has argued convincingly, PZ probably attributed to the synod of Tyre decisions which were taken at Antioch in 513. The synod of Tyre, which could only have been held after the removal of its Chalcedonian bishop Epiphanius, may therefore just have ratified his deposition and the choice of a successor. See de Halleux 1963, 79–85 with the table on 82 showing just how close PZ's two accounts (vii.10 and vii.12) and PD's are; cf. Grillmeier ii.1, 321–2/281–5, Allen and Hayward 2004, 18–19, Meier 2009, 292, but cf. Haarer 2006, 159–60, preferring to accept the holding of two distinct councils.

John became bishop.¹⁸⁶

e. Sergius the Grammarian composed a book of censure [52] of the synod of Tyre after a short time and gave it to the monks from Palestine who shared his opinion. Because of this, when the holy Severus learned of it, he wrote a refutation of it in a lengthy treatise. With arguments from the true doctors of the church and demonstrations from them he confirmed his teaching in three volumes [entitled] *Against the Grammarian*.¹⁸⁷ The rest of the books by this doctor Severus, his commentaries, his *Catechesis*, his treatise *Against Julian the Fantasiast* and the marvellous *Dogmatic Letter* are of great profit and serve to educate the lovers of doctrine.¹⁸⁸

a. The eleventh chapter of the seventh book provides information concerning the petition of the monks of the East and Cosmas of Qenneshrin (Chalcis) that was presented to the synod in the time of the bishops Flavian and Philoxenus which met in Sidon in the year 560 of the era of the Antiochenes.¹⁸⁹

‘First of all we give thanks to Christ, who is God Almighty, and we thank also our merciful and Christ-loving emperor who has established for

186 At the synod described by PZ, representatives from both Alexandria and Jerusalem were present, as well as Severus himself and Philoxenus. The synod interpreted the *Henoticon* as necessarily involving the rejection of Chalcedon, thus confirming the harder line of Severus and Philoxenus and making the position of moderates like Elias of Jerusalem untenable; Elias was exiled in 516, see Lebon 1909, 64–5, Haarer 2006, 160–1. Despite PZ’s statement at vii.12c below that Elias of Jerusalem accepted the decision, it is possible, as Charanis 1974, 99–100, suggests (cf. Gray 1979, 41), that PZ is seeking to talk up the achievements of a synod the aim of which was limited to trying to reconcile Severus with refractory bishops in his patriarchate, as is implied by the reference only to ‘needed reforms’ at vii.12c.

187 Kugener 1904, 321, gives the text and a translation of BL Add. 14,642, fol.28r, an extract which follows PZ almost word for word: this is *Chr. 846*, 220–1/168 and is derived from PZ, see de Halleux 1975–6, 466. Severus’ exchange of letters with Sergius the Monophysite (*Ep.*), followed by an *Apology* by Sergius, survives, ed. and tr. Lebon 1949, tr. Torrance 1988, 143–236. Torrance 1988 also offers a detailed analysis of the correspondence, cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 42–4. Mich. Syr. ix.10 (262c/163) refers to John rather than Sergius, no doubt because Severus was also the author of a tract *Contra gramm.*, directed against John the Grammarian, composed in 519, on which see Gray 1979, 115–21, Allen and Hayward 2004, 44–6. The synod condemned by Sergius was that of Tyre, not Chalcedon: see Lebon 1909, 167 and n.4. *PLRE* ii, Sergius, unnecessarily claims that PZ’s reference to Sergius here is in error for John (Ioannes 74 in *PLRE*).

188 On Severus’ works in general see n.180 above. The *Catechesis* and *Dogmatic Letter* are not otherwise known. His exchanges with Julian are dealt with in detail by PZ below, ix.9–13, cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 46–9.

189 See n.177 above on Cosmas, his petition, the synod of Sidon, and the dating, which PZ presumably found in his source, since he does not use the Antiochene era elsewhere.

all of you the zeal of the piety of God, and called this your holy assembly to one place in the name of the one unique Messiah, the Son of God, in order that through him you may gather everyone into the one faith that the holy Scriptures handed down, and which the fathers preserved at all times, while standing with one mind, and being in unison and agreeing with one another in one good act,¹⁹⁰ teaching everyone the divine teaching through the Holy Spirit that spoke through them. For our Lord has deemed you worthy and has chosen you in these times for the unity of his [53] holy churches, not in order for you to create a new faith for them, because that [faith] that was defined in writing by the 318 holy fathers who gathered in Nicaea suffices for the confirmation of the holy Scriptures, but rather that you should build up [this] faith that has always existed, and whose destruction many have rebelliously desired, speaking what is 'not from the mouth of the Lord,' as the prophet said, 'but from their stomachs.'¹⁹¹ They have separated from among themselves by their wicked devices those who in the simplicity of their hearts keep the tradition of the holy fathers, who agreed with one another in the orthodox faith.

b. For it is Christ, O holy men, who is divided by them; so long as he is abused it is impossible at any time for the church to come to one agreement, given that it is torn apart by them through notions of diverse words. For it is written, 'every kingdom that is divided against itself will not stand,'¹⁹² and also, 'if you bite one another and eat one another, watch out lest one by one you perish.'¹⁹³ Since we are the one body in Christ and we are members from among his members, according to the saying of the divine apostle,¹⁹⁴ we approach Your Holinesses with confidence as shepherds, pleading that you preserve the orthodox faith for the whole world, spotless like the beautiful dove mentioned in the Song of Songs,¹⁹⁵ that you separate it from all heresies, which possess the mask of the religion of God, surrounding it like queens, concubines, and young women, eager to associate with her and to be [one and] the same, and through it [54] be received as being true. In doing this you will receive the reward and will hear our Lord who said, 'The one who confesses me before human beings I will confess before my heavenly father.'¹⁹⁶ Then as stewards of the divine words, separate the pure from the

190 Or 'man.'

191 Jeremiah 23.16.

192 Mark 3.24.

193 1 Corinthians 12.27, Galatians 5.15.

194 Romans 12.5.

195 Song of Songs/Solomon 5.2, 6.9.

196 Matthew 10.32

polluted, as he said,¹⁹⁷ and banish those who mixed weeds with pure wheat,¹⁹⁸ and their evil teaching with them, for he said, ‘cast out the injurious one from the assembly, and victory will go forth with it.’¹⁹⁹

c. Although what has been said is obvious and known, it was necessary to begin by showing how the holy fathers, by agreeing in the one orthodox faith, were firmly establishing everyone in one accord, whereas the heretics have mixed lawless contentions with the words of the holy fathers, and mingling in them the evils of division have split up the holy churches. It is they whom the prophet rebuked, saying, ‘your innkeepers mix water with wine,’²⁰⁰ and so the rest of the petition, which contains many citations from the fathers supporting the seventy-seven objections against the Council of Chalcedon.²⁰¹

a. The twelfth chapter concerns the synod that took place in Tyre in the time of the doctors Severus and Philoxenus and the bishops who were with them who distinctly and openly condemned the council and the Tome.²⁰²

After Flavian, Severus became [bishop] of Antioch, a man knowledgeable and distinguished in the wisdom of the Greeks, an eloquent man who renounced [the world], and an accomplished monk. He was zealous for the true faith, [55] and was accomplished in reading with discernment the holy Scriptures and their interpretation by the ancient writers, those students of the apostles: Hierotheus, Dionysius, Titus, and also Timothy,²⁰³ and after them Ignatius and Clement, *and the other Dionysius and the other Clement*,

197 Malachi 3.18.

198 Matthew 13.25.

199 Proverbs 22.10, but with a misreading of *neikos* (Gk. ‘quarrel’) for *nika* (Gk. ‘victory’), cf. PZV ii, 37 n.6.

200 Isaiah 1.22.

201 PZ’s final statement clearly shows that either he or his source had the entire document before them, which he (or his source) preferred to omit. The same extract, evidently the opening section of the document, is given in almost identical terms by Mich. Syr. ix.10 (262–3c/163–5). See also n.178 above.

202 Cf. Mich. Syr. ix.10 (264c/165–6) for this chapter (abbreviated save for some additions to section a).

203 Hierotheus is a source claimed by Pseudo-Dionysius (the Areopagite), who is said to have been contemporary with the apostle Paul, see B. Suchla, *LThK* 5 (1996), 96. Dionysius is Pseudo-Dionysius (the Areopagite), a highly influential work of the fifth/sixth century attributed to an Athenian Christian of the first century A.D., on whom see (e.g.) *EEC* 335, n.207 below and PZ ix n.210. Titus and Timothy are the recipients of letters ascribed to Paul, *EEC* 1134–5, 1131–2.

and Irenaeus,²⁰⁴ and the [writings] of Gregory, Basil, Athanasius, Julius, *and Cyril*,²⁰⁵ and the rest of the archbishops and true teachers of the holy church. Just as ‘a scribe who was a disciple of the kingdom of heaven, who brings out from his treasury both the old and the new’²⁰⁶ so did he work through many histories *and the sound teachings that are stored up in them*, and they were clearly fixed like a vision in his mind.²⁰⁷

b. This Philoxenus was a Syriac doctor who also read with diligence whatever is found in this language, as well as being proficient in the teaching of the school of Diodore and Theodore, and the others. Nevertheless, as his actions proved to those who have discernment, this old and zealous man truly was a believer.²⁰⁸

c. They explicitly informed the Emperor Anastasius, who rejected the Council of Chalcedon with all his reason, and he commanded that a synod of the [clergy] in the East should be assembled in Tyre to make the needed reforms. It was assembled with bishops from the provinces of Antioch, Apamea, Euphratesia, Osrhoene, Mesopotamia, Arabia, and Phoenice Libanensis. Illuminating the true faith, [Severus] explained the text [56] of the *Henoticon* of Zeno as being an annulment of what had been done

204 Ignatius was the author of several letters and bishop of Antioch in the early second century, *EEC* 559–60; Clement was bishop of Rome late in the first century, to whom two works were attributed, *EEC* 264–5; (the other) Dionysius is probably the bishop of Corinth, c.170, also the author of letters, *EEC*, 334; Clement refers to Clement of Alexandria (c.160–215), who wrote extensively on theological matters, *EEC* 262–4; Irenaeus (c.115–c.202), bishop of Lyons, wrote a work against heresies, *EEC* 587–9.

205 Gregory of Nazianzus (*EEC* 491–5) or of Nyssa (*EEC* 495–8), Basil of Caesarea (*EEC* 169–72), the three Cappadocian fathers of the fourth century; Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (*EEC* 137–40), Julius, bishop of Rome (*EEC* 644), both also of the fourth century; Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria in the fifth century, on whom see PZ iii n.15, *EEC* 310–12.

206 Matthew 23.52.

207 On Severus generally see n.180 above. As Gelzer 1892, 45 n.1, points out, this is one of the earliest references to Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite; cf. ix.15f for another. Mich. Syr’s list of authors read by Severus (reproduced by Kugener 1904, 272 with n.1) is slightly different; we have supplemented PZ’s text from Mich. Syr. here.

208 Philoxenus was from Bet Garmaï, a region in northern Mesopotamia inside the Persian empire. Consequently he was well read in the texts revered by the Persian church, especially Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus, as he mentions himself; he may even have studied at the school of Edessa, which was forced to move to Nisibis in Persia in 489. See de Halleux 1963, 12–15, 28–30 with Abramowski 1965a, 865–6, Meier 2009, 253–7; de Halleux 1963, 18–22 on his character, as described by PZ and other sources. Cf. *Melkite Chronicle* 13 in de Halleux 1978, 31–3 with his comments in de Halleux 1975/6, 263–5. See also Grillmeier ii.3, 500–69 on Philoxenus; see PZ iii n.25 on Diodore and Theodore.

in Chalcedon and he openly condemned there the addition to the faith.²⁰⁹ The bishops who were assembled with the believing doctors Severus and Philoxenus at the head of the bishops resolutely proclaimed the entire truth. They wrote a letter of concord to John of Alexandria and to Timothy of the imperial city, and also to Elias of Jerusalem, who was at that time in agreement concerning these matters, although he was shortly thereafter deposed and John became bishop after him.²¹⁰

d. Thus, the priests were once again united by agreement on the faith, with the exception of the see of Rome, because Theoderic had become Anticaesar there, and rebelled in the western part [of the empire] against Anastasius and seized the government in Rome.²¹¹ He was a warlike man who greatly assisted the people of Italy, rescuing them in his time from the barbarians and the Goths. He bestowed many things on his city, Rome, by building and granting [it] precedence.²¹² However, he was a Dyophysite, having been converted from the Arian heresy. Consequently, neither Symmachus nor his successor Hormisdas who were the archbishops in Rome were in agreement with the East.²¹³ Those who are diligent may learn

209 We take PZ as indicating that Severus expounded the *Henoticon*, rather than Philoxenus (with Gelzer in Gelzer and Nöldeke 1892, 335 n.4, against Nöldeke, *ibid.*, and with Kugener 1904, 273).

210 Most of this paragraph repeats, often word for word, vii.10d above, although the concluding sentence on Elias of Jerusalem provides more detail. See n.186 above.

211 Theoderic is rendered here (and at ix.18a) as Alimeric, probably a rendering of 'son of Valamir', 'Oualameriakos' in Mal. 18.9 and elsewhere, so Goltz 2008, 548; PD ii, 14/16 has Ilmarqios. Prostko-Prostyński 1993 argues that 'Anticaesar' is PZ's way of referring to a viceroy or deputy to the emperor, cf. *idem* 1994, 176, Chrysos 1986, 76–7, 80–1. See also PZ vi.6d, ix.1a. It seems as though PZ was unaware that Theoderic was a Goth and thus supposed him (see below) to have been a Chalcedonian; Prostko-Prostyński 1994, 176 n.109 (following *idem* 1993, 21–3) argues that PZ's source is reflecting a positive Byzantine view of Theoderic that prevailed before the Gothic Wars.

212 Gk. *pronomia* (for 'precedence'). On Theoderic's building work at Rome see Ward-Perkins 1984, 44, Johnson 1988, 77, Moorhead 1992, 143, König 1997, 164, attested both by inscriptions and literary sources; Ausbüttel 2003, 86–7, cf. Pani Ermini 1999, 51–2, is more downbeat in his assessment of his activity in Rome, however. Goltz 2008, 549, points out that only PZ among eastern sources refers to this activity. He suggests that PZ had access to a written source, perhaps the same as that used by Proc., as well as the Dominic referred to at ix.18 (where similar details are given about Theoderic). This positive portrayal is somewhat at odds with his mention of the king at vi.6e (where he is referred to as Theoderic rather than Alimeric), cf. Goltz 2009, 190–3, suggesting that PZ may not have realised that the two names designated one and the same person.

213 Symmachus was consecrated on 22 November 498 but spent some years struggling to occupy his throne in the face of a rival candidate, Laurentius, consecrated on the same

about them from the letter that Philoxenus wrote after his expulsion.²¹⁴

a. The thirteenth chapter gives information about the Empress Ariadne who died, and the tyrant Vitalian who appeared [57] and who seized Hypatius in battle.

Empress Ariadne was Zeno's wife and was allied to Anastasius after the death of her husband, and it was she who made him emperor. She administered the empire for a certain number of years, as many as forty, through the status of her two marriages. Then she died in the year 824 of the Greeks.²¹⁵ Her husband remained, keeping the truth in holiness, since he was advanced in age and occupied with the affairs of his administration.

b. He had trouble and concern because of Vitalian,²¹⁶ a general and a Goth,²¹⁷ who was warlike, courageous, bold, and ruthless in battle. Many savage people gathered around this man who gave them gold with a liberal hand, and they further profited from plundering the empire of Anasta-

day. The split is known as the Laurentian schism. Only in 505 was Symmachus able, with Theoderic's help, to gain the upper hand; he subsequently adopted a hard line in his dealings with Anastasius. Symmachus died in 514 and was succeeded by Hormisdas, who proved only slightly less intransigent in his negotiations with the emperor. See Moorhead 1992, 114–35, Ausbüttel 2003, 96–107, Haarer 2006, 133–6, 172–5, 180–1. Theoderic never converted from Arianism, however, although even some western sources sometimes imply that he was orthodox, cf. Moorhead 1992, 93.

214 The work of Philoxenus referred to is the *Letter to the monks of Senun*: see AK 351. PZ has in mind not Theoderic but the earlier sections of the chapter. The reference is incorrect, however, since in that work, at 76–7/63, he refers not to the synod of Tyre but to that which took place at Antioch: see n.185 and de Halleux 1963, 82 n.45.

215 On Ariadne see *PLRE* ii, Ariadne. PZ's date (AG 824 = 512/13) is incorrect: she died in 515. PZ glosses over the fact that she was a supporter of Chalcedon, however, cf. Haarer 2006, 152 (on her meeting with St Sabas).

216 On Vitalian's revolt see Greatrex 1996a and Haarer 2006, 164–79, Meier 2007, 203–8, idem 2009, 295–301. The *magister militum per Illyricum* Vitalian, a staunch supporter of Chalcedon, revolted in 513 or 514. He advanced on Constantinople but was persuaded by concessions from Anastasius to withdraw. The emperor then sent an army against Vitalian which was heavily defeated. Another army, under the emperor's nephew Hypatius, was likewise beaten by Vitalian, and Hypatius taken prisoner. Further concessions accompanied the ransoming of Hypatius, but they were not honoured. In 515 Vitalian advanced upon the capital once again, but on this occasion he was decisively defeated in a naval engagement by forces under the leadership of Marinus (see n.171 above); the imperial ships made use of an early version of Greek fire. See Greatrex 1996a, 135.

217 Marc. *com.* a. 514, 519 also refers to Vitalian as a Scythian, i.e. a Goth, cf. *PLRE* ii, Vitalianus 2. The fullest primary account of his uprising is to be found in Joh. Ant. frg.242. He enjoyed the support of Hunnic allies, see Greatrex 1996a, 133 and n.29, cf. Meier 2009, 295–6.

sus. When he had been at peace for a long time,²¹⁸ Vitalian betrayed the emperor²¹⁹ and became a rebel and wreaked destruction on the dominion of the Romans, disturbing the empire and treating it with contempt. Arrogantly and without fear he approached the suburbs of Constantinople.

c. On one occasion Anastasius sent armies against him led by Hypatius, and they were defeated by him and Hypatius was captured. He insulted him very much and abused him by confining him in a pigsty. On one occasion they publicly humiliated him, dragging him around with the army in profound abasement because Hypatius had once seized the wife of Vitalian and mistreated her, for which Vitalian's hate against him was very strong; [58] for Hypatius had been lustful in the impulse of his youth and was racked with the desire for women. Finally he was ransomed with a great sum of gold that was sent to him on his behalf, and returned from being held captive by Vitalian, and [as it is said], 'Punishment is wisdom.'²²⁰

a. The fourteenth chapter of the seventh book tells about Timothy who died and John who became bishop [of Constantinople] after him; and about the people who came to the festival in Jerusalem who were possessed by demons, who barked at the cross on the [feast of the] dedication [of the Church of the Basilica].

Timothy lived six or seven years [as bishop] and then died in year eleven, and John became bishop after him.²²¹ In that same year when the emperor

218 The reference to a long period of peace is puzzling, although it might indicate an earlier date for the revolt (513), followed by an uneasy truce between commander and emperor.

219 PZ naturally claims that Vitalian, rather than Anastasius, broke his word, presumably after his victories in 514. Modern scholars tend to see the emperor as failing to abide by the terms agreed: see Charanis 1974, 80–5, noting that the synod at Heraclea, demanded by Vitalian, did not take place, and Greatrex 1996a, 133–4.

220 PZ is remarkably well informed about both Hypatius and Vitalian. The latter's wife is otherwise unattested; it is uncertain when Hypatius took her prisoner. Hypatius was captured by Vitalian after he had leapt into the sea in the wake of his total defeat outside Acra, see Joh. Ant. frg.242.9; he was then ransomed by Anastasius for a heavy price. PZ's concluding remark, apparently indicating the sobering effect of his ill-treatment upon Hypatius, is curious. It is true that Hypatius visited Jerusalem in 516, shortly after his release, perhaps in fulfilment of a vow; yet there, having hitherto apparently shared his uncle's anti-Chalcedonian views, he openly claimed to support the monks assembled with him, who were united in supporting the council. See Greatrex 1996a, 122–4, 136–8. The quotation is probably an allusion to Psalm 110 (111).10 or perhaps to Job 28.28.

221 Indiction year 11 is 517/18; Timothy died on 5 April 518. In his stead was appointed John, a luke-warm opponent of Chalcedon like his predecessor. See Stein 1949, 191, Haarer 2006, 182.

Anastasius was going to die, some Egyptians, Alexandrians and some from beyond the Jordan, Edomites, and Arabs came to the feast of the dedication, which is the assembling of the cross in Jerusalem that takes place on the fourteenth of September. Demons took possession of many and they were barking at the cross, then stopped and went out [from them].²²² This gave concern and anxiety to those who are discerning. However, they did not entirely understand the reason until the event occurred and was demonstrated to concern the dispute and the stumbling-block that arose concerning the faith. God made this known ahead of time that we might understand the temptation and be proved by it, and have joy by enduring it and persevering in the faith. As the apostle James said, 'All joy be with you, my brothers, as you enter many and diverse temptations, for you know that the proof of the faith has conferred on you patience; and for patience let there be perfected action, so that you may be perfect and complete, and not lacking in anything.'²²³

b. [59] Anastasius died on the ninth of July, and Justin succeeded him, he who had gone down for military duty with the generals when Kavadh, the king of the Persians, came to Amida. He was an old and handsome man with grey hair but was not educated.²²⁴ He was of the same faith as the inhabitants of Rome because he belonged to that province, being from the camp called Mauriana where the water is bad and turns to blood when it is boiled.²²⁵

222 The incident which PZ relates here must have occurred in September 517; the same account, derived from PZ, is found in PD ii, 14–15/16; see Witakowski 1991, 258. Th. Lect. 516 likewise recounts the barking of people in and around Alexandria; some suggested that this unholy phenomenon had been sent to prevent people going from Egypt to Jerusalem for the exaltation of the cross. Stathakopoulos 2004, no.83, suggests, following Patlagean 1977, 83, that the reference could be to an outbreak of ergotism, caused by the consumption of unsuitable food. The encaenia referred to is the commemoration of the dedication of the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre by Constantine, an event with which the 'invention' (i.e. discovery) of the cross by his mother Helena came to be associated. See Witakowski 1996a, 16 n.101 for details of the feast (celebrated on 14 September), cf. Drijvers and Drijvers 1997, 18. PZ seems to be drawing on a local Jerusalem source here. A comparable episode of mass hysteria is reported at Amida and other eastern cities in 560: see PD ii, 115–18/104–7 with Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 131 and Stathakopoulos 2004, no.135.

223 James 1.2–4.

224 The Syriac text is probably corrupt; Mai construed it to read 'hirsute.'

225 Anastasius died in the night of 9–10 July 518. The accession of Justin is recounted in detail in *De Cer.* i.93, 426–30, on which see Vasiliev 1950, 68–82, Stein 1949, 219–20. Justin, his successor, was a supporter of Chalcedon and moved quickly to restore relations with the papacy; see (e.g.) Evans 1996, 77. He had been a commander in the Persian war fought under Anastasius, cf. Greatrex 1998, 94. Most of the information here given on Justin I is repeated at viii.1, although there no reference is made to his origins at Castra Mauriana, a garbled allusion

In this book is a span of twenty-seven years, three and a half months, the lifetime of Anastasius.²²⁶

a. The fifteenth chapter of the seventh book, which indicates the archbishops in the time of the Emperor Anastasius.

These are the archbishops during the time of the Emperor Anastasius. The Dyophysites Felix of Rome, and after him Symmachus, and then Hormisdas, who is [bishop] now. Of Alexandria: the believing men Athanasius and his successor John, and then another John, and Dioscorus who is now in office. Of Antioch: Flavian who was driven out and then the believing Severus. Of Constantinople: Euphemius, Macedonius who was deposed, the believing Timothy, then John who accepted the council at the start of the reign of Justin and then immediately died, and after him Epiphanius became bishop. Of Jerusalem: Sallust and after him Elias who was deposed, and John who accepted the Council in the time of Justin, and his successor Peter.²²⁷

to Bederiana in Thrace, also to be found in Mich. Syr. ix.12 (265a/169); see further PZ ix.1a and n.19. Debié 2004a, 162, suggests that the reference to contaminated waters is a way of showing how sinister the reign of the Chalcedonian Justin would be; she incorrectly attributes the report to Jac. Ede. *Chr.* rather than PZ, however. See also Vasiliev 1950, 59.

226 Anastasius' reign lasted from 11 April 491 to 9 July 518, i.e. almost exactly 27 years and three months.

227 Both here and at viii.6 PZ offers a list of patriarchs; similar lists may be found in PD ii,15/17 (for Anastasius), 110/98–9. For a detailed discussion of these lists see Introduction, section C (3)(iii); see also appendix 2. In the case of the present list, certain inferences are possible. The date of composition of PZ's source for this chapter emerges from the extra details supplied. Pope Hormisdas, said to be still alive, died on 6 August 523. Dioscorus, on the other hand, was dead already in 517, having only become patriarch in 516. John, patriarch of Constantinople was succeeded in February 520 by Epiphanius. At Jerusalem, Peter succeeded to the patriarchate April 524. We might conclude from this that PZ's source is connected with Jerusalem and was writing soon after Peter's accession; hence news from Rome would not yet have reached him of Hormisdas' death. The failure to mention Timothy III of Alexandria (patriarch from 517 to 535) remains puzzling, however.

BOOK EIGHT

a. [60] The eighth book is narrated below in these chapters. The first chapter is concerning the reign of Justin, concerning the *praepositus* Amantius, who was killed in the palace, and concerning Theocritus his *domesticus* and Andrew the *cubicularius*. The second chapter gives information concerning the tyrant Vitalian who was killed in the palace, he and Paul his *notarius* and Celer his *domesticus*. In the third chapter are made known [the events] concerning the martyrs who were killed in Najran in the capital city of the Himyarites by that Jewish tyrant. The fourth chapter gives information concerning the waters that entered Edessa, and [as to how] the overflow of water from Siloam in Jerusalem was held back, and how Antioch was toppled by an earthquake, and [how] the temple of Solomon in the city of Ba'albek was *burnt*. The fifth chapter gives information concerning the negotiations that took place on the frontier, and concerning Mundhir, the king of the Ṭayyayê who crossed into Roman territory, and concerning the bishops who were driven out. The sixth chapter concerns those who were archbishops in the time of this emperor Justin. The seventh chapter concerns the *Prologue* of the bishop Mara.

a. The first chapter of the eighth book concerns the reign of Justin.

In the year 829 of the era of the Greeks, on the tenth of July, when [indiction] year eleven was about to end and Anastasius had died, Justin became king after him.¹ He was an old man, handsome, [61] he was *curopalates*,² and

1 Indiction 11 is A.D. 517/18, cf. PZ vii n.221, and so the reference is to July 518.

2 Justin's appearance is related in greater detail by Mal. 17.1, who also describes him as handsome and white-haired. See Vasiliev 1950, 85–6, for an overview of physical descriptions of the emperor. Witakowski 1991, 258–9, plausibly suggests that this description goes back to Mal. through Joh. Eph., while Debié 2004a, 148–50, argues that PZ may have consulted Mal. directly. No other source refers to Justin as *curopalates*, a dignity that did exist at this time, however, and later was frequently held by the person marked out to succeed to the throne (e.g. Justin II under Justinian, cf. Stein 1949, 742). See Guillard 1976, iii, 188–9, 197. It is just possible that the case of Justin II has influenced PZ in his reference to Justin I as *curopalates*, whereas other sources are united in referring to him as count of the excubitors. See PLRE ii, Iustinus 4, for the suggestion.

illiterate.³ When he entered Constantinople from the camp of Mauriana in Illyricum,⁴ the able Marinus from Apamea who was *chartularius* depicted him in the bathhouses with the entire story of his entry into Constantinople, and how he proceeded from one rank to the next until he became emperor.⁵ When he had been censured for this and drew near to danger, this Marinus, who had confidence in his own acuity, readily replied, 'I have employed pictures for the information of the observant and for the edification of those with discernment, so that the great men, the rich, and the children of important families not trust in their power, their wealth, and the importance of their noble families, but in God, "who raises the unfortunate man from the dung pile and places him at the head of the people,"⁶ "and rules the human kingdom, to give it to whomever he wishes, to set the lowest of humanity over it,"⁷ and he chooses those of humble families in the world, and the despised, and those who are nothing, in order to remove those who are something.' So he was accepted, and was rescued from peril.⁸

3 The assertion that Justin was illiterate is false, although it is to be found also in *Proc. Anecd.* vi.11–16, cf. *Mal.* 17.1. See the full discussion of Vasiliev 1950, 82–5 with Baldwin 1989, Schlange-Schöningen 1995, 32–3, Rosen 1999, 777, Croke 2007, 18: in the case of both Theodoric and Justin it probably indicates no more than a general lack of culture. On Justin's reign in general see Croke 2007, stressing the emperor's competence.

4 See PZ vii n.225 on Castra Mauriana.

5 On Justin's advancement since reaching Constantinople c.470 see Vasiliev 1950, 66–8, Rosen 1999, 765, Croke 2007, 19–20; he had been count of the excubitors since 515. On his origins in Bederiana in Thrace (PZ's Mauriana) see Vasiliev 1950, 52–9. See also Debić 2004a, 162, on the Syriac form (which she attributes to John of Ephesus). His elevation to the throne, as Marinus' justification implies, was unexpected (cf. *Evagr.* iv.1, *Proc. Wars* i.11.1) and took place despite the existence of a considerable number of more noble alternative candidates, including Anastasius' three nephews, Hypatius, Pompey and Probus. See Vasiliev 1950, 74–5, Greatrex 1996a, 120–1, Whitby 2000a, 200 n.3, Croke 2007, 16–17.

6 Psalm 112 (113).7.

7 Daniel 5.21.

8 On Marinus, see PZ vii n.171. No other source reports the depiction of Justin's advancement in a public bath (*dēmosion*, cf. e.g. *Mal.* 15.1, 18.17 for the term [*contra* Vasiliev 1950, 90 n.68, who thought that it refers rather to a government building]). Marinus may have felt he had to demonstrate his loyalty to the emperor, given his association with the previous regime and with Anastasius' anti-Chalcedonian policies; his house had been the target of a riot in 512, and he had also been the architect of Vitalian's defeat in 515. See *PLRE* ii, Marinus 7. Vasiliev 1950, 89–90, discusses the episode at length and unnecessarily seeks to distinguish this Marinus from the praetorian prefect. *Chr.* 846, 222/169, follows PZ's version here.

With the depiction of this episode in a bathhouse one might compare the anecdote recounted by Th. Lect. 465 and frg.52a-b (pp.131–3), about an Arian who, under Anastasius, was struck down after blaspheming, an episode then commemorated by a picture in the Helenianae baths at Constantinople.

b. Amantius the *praepositus* and his associate Andrew the *cubicularius* favoured and were friends with Theocritus his *domesticus*,⁹ and after the death of Anastasius he [Amantius] gave him [Theocritus] a considerable sum of gold for this old man Justin, the *curopalates*, in order to make payments to the *scholariii* and the other soldiers so that they would make Theocritus emperor. Justin, by giving gold to them won their favour and they made him emperor, as what happened in this matter was what the Lord willed. Since he was of the same opinion as the Romans, with all authority he commanded that the council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo be proclaimed. Amantius was opposing this, saying, ‘The signatures [62] of the three patriarchs and the important bishops of your dominion who wrote and anathematised the Council of Chalcedon are not dry!’ Since he behaved with such boldness, Amantius the *praepositus* along with Theocritus the *domesticus* and Andrew the *cubicularius* were immediately executed.¹⁰

c. After that year John the bishop of Constantinople died, and after him Epiphanius became bishop,¹¹ and because Severus departed from Antioch from fear of the emperor’s threats, who had ordered that his tongue be cut out,¹² Paul who was called ‘the Jew’ and who commemorated Nestorius,

9 Amantius was *praepositus sacri cubiculi*, in charge of the imperial bedchamber, Andrew a chamberlain, and Theocritus a *domesticus* (personal assistant). AK 353 suggest, however, that in this case it is just a translation of the Greek *oikeios*, i.e. a member of Amantius’ household. Such an obscure position for a potential emperor seems unlikely; see also Greatrex 2007a, 103 n.22.

10 On the conspiracy of Amantius and the various traditions on it, see Greatrex 2007a, Croke 2007, 26, Menze 2008a, 22–4. PZ’s version is in line with the accounts of Malalas (17.2), *Chr. Pasch.* 611–12, Theoph. 165–6, although PZ brings out more strongly that it was the emperor’s pro-Chalcedonian stance that provoked Amantius to oppose the regime. While Menze 2008a, 30, argues that Justin adopted his stance as a result of popular pressure, Croke 2007, 19, rightly sees him as a Chalcedonian of conviction. Both ACO iii, p.74.33–4, and Mal., as preserved in *Excerpta de insidiis* (ed. Thurn, p.337.*1–5), make clear that Amantius was well known as an opponent of the council, unpopular with the people of Constantinople for this reason: they cried out against him in Hagia Sophia on Monday 16 July, on which see Vasiliev 1950, 141, Anastos 1985, 129–34. Amantius also received Sev. *Coll. Ep.* 51, *PO* 12 (1919), 325–6. Proc. *Anecd.* vi.26 claims that Amantius was executed within ten days of Justin’s accession for having insulted the patriarch John. This allegation may be connected with PZ’s report of Amantius’ outburst, since the three patriarchs must be those of Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople; patriarch John of Constantinople, however, readily accepted the new imperial line.

11 Patriarch John of Constantinople died in early 520; Epiphanius succeeded to the throne on 25 February that year, see Stein 1949, 230.

12 Severus withdrew from Antioch in September 518: see Maspero 1923, 70, for details of the chronology and cf. Evagr. iv.4 with Whitby 2000a, 203 n.9, Menze 2008a, 44. Evagr. confirms the report that Vitalian (or Justin) gave orders for Severus’ tongue to be cut out and

succeeded him and was then driven out. Then Euphrasius became bishop, who was burned by a vat of burning scented wax during the earthquake in Antioch.¹³

a. The second chapter of the eighth book gives information concerning the tyrant Vitalian, and how he and Paul the *notarius* and Celer the *domesticus* were killed in the palace.

The tyrant Vitalian was a general during the time of Anastasius. He was a Goth, warlike and of a courageous mind, whom the barbarians obeyed. It was said that he wanted to make a rebellion against Anastasius, who exacted an oath from him, which Vitalian did not keep, but he rebelled and rallied the barbarian nations around him, and made an assault on the domain of Anastasius, and captured cities and their villages, and marched as far as the royal city. He besieged it and harassed the emperor in many ways, and caused him anxiety because he seized Hypatius who had gone out against him and destroyed his army, and carried him around with him, insulting him and openly abusing him, and returned him for a large sum of gold that he took in exchange for him.¹⁴ When Anastasius died, [a letter] was written from this old man [63] Justin, exhorting him and pacifying him, so that he would not again be bold and rebel during his reign, as he was accustomed to do. Following Vitalian were diverse nations and Goths, and so he arrived with confidence, and the emperor went out to the *martyrion* of Euphemia at Chalcedon.¹⁵ They gave oaths to one another and then entered the city,

attributes it to the fact that Severus had insulted him. On Vitalian and the vigorous Chalcedonian policies adopted by Justin at the opening of his reign, see Vasiliev 1950, 225–8, Maraval 1998, 133–5; Menze 2008a, 44–57, rightly stresses that the government adopted a gradual approach, however.

13 Paul ‘the Jew’, appointed to the see of Antioch in summer 519, proved to be a brutal persecutor of the adversaries of Chalcedon and became so unpopular that Justin accepted his resignation by 1 May 521, cf. *Coll. Avell. epp.* 241–2 with Vasiliev 1950, 206, Downey 1961, 517, Menze 2008a, 48–54. Other sources wrongly claim that Paul died; see Downey 1961, 519 n.71 for references. Persecutions continued under Euphrasius (see Stein 1949, 231–2 but cf. Menze 2008a, 88–9). This patriarch perished in a fire following the earthquake that struck Antioch on 29 May 526: see Evagr. iv.5 with Whitby 2000a, 204, Mal. 18.22. Marc. *com.* a.526 reports the decapitation of Euphrasius, followed by his burial underneath an obelisk from the circus, cf. *Chr. Ede.* 99. These almost contemporary references are more credible than the versions to be found in the Syriac (anti-Chalcedonian) tradition, in PZ, PD ii, 50/46, *Chr.* 819, 9/5, involving a cauldron and burning pitch, cf. Vasiliev 1950, 347–8, Downey 1961, 521 n.81 and now Debié 2004b, 167–8, on the embroidering of the patriarch’s fate in the anti-Chalcedonian tradition.

14 This section merely repeats the information given in vii.13 in slightly different terms.

15 The reconciliation between Justin and Vitalian took place soon after the former’s

and he became one of the leading generals. He entered and went out from the palace with authority, and presided over the course of affairs. He was the spiritual child¹⁶ of Flavian of Antioch, who was driven out, and he had a significant grudge against the holy Severus, who had succeeded Flavian. In the time of Anastasius Vitalian was unable to injure him, but at the beginning of the reign of this old man Justin it was commanded that, wherever he was arrested, his tongue should be cut out, and they say that this was on the advice of Vitalian.¹⁷

b. After some time it happened that while Vitalian was bathing in the royal city, he was commanded by the emperor to come to a banquet, along with his colleague, the general Justinian.¹⁸ He, Paul his *notarius*, and Celer his *domesticus* were coming from the baths, and men who were ready stabbed him as he entered from one house into another, and he and his *notarius* and his *domesticus* were killed. Thus God requited him for the evil he had done in the time of Anastasius, and for breaking his oaths, and his army did no damage.¹⁹

a. The third chapter of the same book gives information concerning the martyrs who were killed in Najran,²⁰ the royal city of the Himyarites, in the

accession. Cf. Evagr. iv.3. Only PZ records the meeting at the Church of Euphemia; on the church itself see PZ vii n.166. Mal. in *Excerpta de Insidiis*, ed. Thurn. 338.*1–3, also refers to the oaths exchanged between emperor and former rebel, cf. Greatrex 2007a, 106, Croke 2007, 23. Debié 2004a, 157, 162–3, argues that PZ derived the information from a version of Mal.

16 Or ‘sponsor.’ On the relationship between Flavian and Vitalian, for which PZ is the only source, see Peeters 1948, 166, arguing that Flavian must have baptised him in Antioch.

17 See n.12 above.

18 An important detail: in 520 Justinian probably succeeded Romanus (on whom see PZ vii n.143) as *magister militum praesentalis* with Vitalian. See Croke 2007, 33.

19 Vitalian, having been appointed *magister militum praesentalis* already in 518 and consul for 520, was assassinated in the imperial palace in July 520, along with his associates Paul and Celerianus. See *PLRE* ii, Vitalianus 2, Vasiliev 1950, 110–13 and cf. Mal. 17.8 and Marc. *com.* a.520. Proc. *Anecd.* vi.28 attributes the murder to Justinian, who undoubtedly profited from the elimination of a potential rival; cf. Meier 2003, 187, listing other sources to take this view. See also Greatrex 2007a, 105–6, noting how the Baroccianus version of Malalas offers a similar justification for Vitalian’s elimination, and Croke 2007, 34–5, suggesting that in 520 Vitalian may have rebelled also against Justin; see now too Meier 2009, 308–10, on Vitalian’s ambitions.

20 Several versions of a letter from Simeon of Bet Arsham concerning the persecution of Christians in the city of Najran in Himyar, southern Arabia, survive. PZ’s (*BHO* 103) is one version of the ‘shorter’ letter of Simeon, which was subsequently used by John of Ephesus and then incorporated into the *Chronicle* of PD ii, 57–67/53–62 (*BHO* 102). See the tr. and comm. of Witakowski 1996a with Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 21, Detoraki 2007, 21, 26–8. A longer version was transmitted separately, for which see Guidi 1881 (an edition and Italian tr.) with

year 835 of the Greeks, being the sixth year of Justin's reign,²¹ as Simeon the bishop and *apocrisarius* of the faithful from the land of [64] the Persians²²

Jeffery 1945, 195–205 (an English translation): variants of this version are *BHO* 99–101, cf. Detoraki 2007, 20. An independent abbreviated Syriac account also exists (*BHO* 104), ed. and tr. Devos 1972. In the 1960s a subsequent letter (known as 'the new letter') written by Simeon was discovered, updating this one, edited and translated by Shahîd 1971: see Detoraki 2007, 36–40, expressing some doubts as to Simeon's authorship. Other sources, in a range of languages, throw further light on these persecutions and testify to their international significance; of these the most important are the *Martyrium Arethae* (in Greek, but versions in other languages exist, derived from the Syriac, but sometimes fuller, cf. Detoraki 2007, 21–6) and the so-called *Book of the Himyarites* (in Syriac, on which see Detoraki 2007, 40–4). For a survey of the whole dossier see Grillmeier ii.4, 311–23/305–16, Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 19–32. For a good account of Christianity in the region and a narrative of events see Tardy 1999, 68–140.

This title section of the chapter furnishes more details than Guidi's version, it should be noted, cf. *Mart. Areth.* 25 with Detoraki 2007, 28. F. Briquel-Chatonnet is preparing a French tr. of the Syriac versions of Simeon's letter, and a further volume will add a commentary.

21 The date of these persecutions, despite the clarity of PZ's introduction, is still a matter of fierce debate; PZ's synchronisation of year 6 of Justin with AG 835 is at any rate correct, cf. Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 44 (despite Detoraki 2007, 28, although *Mart. Areth.* 1 wrongly synchronises 835 with year five of Justin). The majority of scholars support the dating here given, i.e. 523/4. The conference at Râmallâh (Ramla), described at the beginning of the letter, would therefore have taken place in January/February 524 and the persecutions at Najran in October 523. For this view see de Blois 1990, Robin 1996, Tardy 1999, 141–8, Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 48. Because the 'new letter' of Simeon offered a new date in its concluding section, some scholars preferred to move events back by five years, so that the martyrs of Najran would have been killed in late 518 and the conference of Ramla would have taken place in January/February 519. So Shahîd 1971, 235–42 (uncertain), Devos 1974, 114–16, Rubin 1989, 392–3. For a full discussion see Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, esp. 42–55.

The background to the persecutions here described is a struggle between the Christian and Jewish communities in Himyar, modern-day Yemen. In the late fifth century tensions ran high between the two groups, leading to at least one martyrdom (in 467). Although some of the Himyarite kings were Christians, others were Jewish and took a hard line in their dealings with the Christians, both those of Himyar and those from abroad: Romans and Ethiopians alike frequented the ports of Himyar. Towards the end of the fifth century, one king executed Roman traders, but his actions were avenged by an Ethiopian ruler. In 522, a new Himyarite ruler, Dhu Nuwas, came to the throne and, having defeated the Ethiopian garrisons in his territory, sought to form an international coalition to combat the Christians. For a more detailed account of these events, see Greatrex 1998, 225–40, who (probably wrongly) follows the earlier chronology, cf. Grillmeier ii.4, 311–25/305–19, Rubin 1989. Following the later chronology: Rabello 1987, 179–91, Müller 1991, 312–22, Robin 1996, Bosworth 1999, 192–5 nn.487–8, Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 73–83, Hoyland 2001, 51–5 (a good introduction), Robin 2008, 173–5.

22 Simeon of Bet Arsham was known as 'the Persian debater' for his rhetorical skills; he was the bishop of Bet Arsham near Seleucia (see Levenq 1935). His biography is recounted by Joh. Eph., *Lives*, *PO* 17 (1923), 137–58, who had met him in Constantinople before his death c.540. The chronology of his movements remains somewhat uncertain: see Shahîd

wrote to Simeon, the abbot of Gabbula,²³ as follows.

We inform Your Charity that on the twentieth of January of this year, 835 of the Greeks, we went out from Hirta de-Nu‘man²⁴ with the priest Abraham the son of Euphrasius, who was sent by emperor Justin to Mundhir to conclude peace.²⁵ We also wrote concerning him in our first letter,²⁶ and here we, all the believers, are grateful to him for helping our party. He is familiar with what we wrote in the first letter and in the one that we now write. For we have travelled through the wilderness to the south and to the east, a journey of ten days, and we met with Mundhir at the foot of the mountains which are called ‘The Sand Mountains,’ and in the language of the Tayyayê ‘Râmallâh.’²⁷ When we entered Mundhir’s camp, some pagan and nomadic

1971, 135–9, 159–72, Hainthaler in Grillmeier ii.3, 263–5, Labourt 1904, 158, Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 51–2, Becker 2006, 47–8. An *apocrisiarius* (see glossary) is normally the representative of a bishop at court; he would not usually be a bishop himself therefore. It seems likely that by this designation PZ means that Simeon was the anti-Chalcedonian representative at the Persian court, cf. AK 355, Vasiliev 1950, 280. See also Shahîd 1964, 117 and n.6, Detoraki 2007, 15–17.

23 The addressee of the letter, Simeon of Gabbula (or his monastery) is referred to also at viii.5d as being ‘zealous for the faith’; he is there described as being the archimandrite of the monastery of Isaac at Gabbula (in Syria I) and as having suffered expulsion in the reign of Justin I. See Shahîd 1971, 33–4, Beaucamp 1999–2000, 20 and n.19, 53, Detoraki 2007, 51–2. The letter must therefore have reached him not at Gabbula, but in the countryside of Mesopotamia, where the banished Miaphysites had congregated (described by PZ viii.5).

24 Hirta de-Nu‘man is the camp of Mundhir, the Lakhmid chief, usually known as Hira. The reference to Nu‘man may be to the father of Mundhir, see Shahîd 1964, 124 n.38. On the encampment itself see Robin 2008, 185–7: it was a collection of scattered villages rather than an actual city, which explains its name (*hirta* being the Syriac for ‘camp’).

25 Abraham was a Chalcedonian priest and a regular Roman ambassador to the Arab tribes: see *PLRE* ii, Abraham 2. His principal object in this case was the liberation of two commanders recently captured by Mundhir, Timostratus and John, see *Proc. Wars* i.17.44, Shahîd 1964, 121, as well as to conclude a peace treaty with the Nasrid rulers (often referred to as Lakhmids). See Vasiliev 1950, 281, Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 50–1. Mundhir had undertaken at least one large raid across the frontier in the recent past, see Shahîd 1995, 43–6, Greatrex 1998, 131 and n.30.

26 Simeon’s earlier letter has not been preserved. Shahîd 1971, 114–17, argues that it was written at Râmallâh, not long after Simeon’s arrival, and that much of it was then incorporated into the present letter. Simeon here perhaps alludes to Justin’s support of anti-Chalcedonians in Persia, although no details are known (and the *Chronicle of Seert*, *PO* 7 [1911], ch.22, 142–4, implies the reverse). Shahîd 1964, 119 n.23, argues that Simeon is rather thanking Abraham for support given to the Miaphysite cause. As is shown by the subsequent Roman support for the overthrow of Dhu Nuwas, Chalcedonian emperors had no hesitation in supporting anti-Chalcedonians outside the empire.

27 The location of Râmallâh, i.e. ‘sand’, is uncertain, but see the discussion of Shahîd 1964, 121 n.20. It may be found on the useful map in Robin 1996, 670.

Ṭayyayê and Ma'dayê²⁸ came up to us and said, 'What are you to do? For see, your Christ is rejected by the Romans, the Persians, and the Himyarites!'²⁹ Being insulted by the Ṭayyayê caused us grief, and with the grief sorrow also came upon us, because during our visit there came a messenger who was sent from the king of the Himyarites³⁰ to Mundhir, and [he] gave him a letter that was full of boasting, in which he had written as follows.

b. [65] 'The king whom the Ethiopians installed in our country is dead, and the season of winter is upon us, and they have not been able to come out to our country to provide a Christian king as they usually do. So I became king over the entire country of the Himyarites, and I planned to destroy first of all every one of the Christians who believes in Christ, if they would not become Jews like us, and I killed 280 priests who were found, and with them the Ethiopians who were guarding the church, and I made their church into our synagogue.³¹ Then with an army of 120,000 I went to Najran, their royal city, and when I besieged it for some time and did not capture it, I swore to them oaths and their leaders came out to me. I decided not to keep my word to the Christians, my enemies, and I seized them and forced them to bring their gold, their silver, and their possessions. They brought them to me, and I took them, and I asked for Paul their bishop,³² and when they said to me 'He has died,' I did not believe them until they showed me his tomb. I had his bones dug up and I burned them along with their church and their priests and all who were found who were taking refuge in it, and the rest I forced to renounce Christ and the cross and become Jews, but they did not want to, and they confessed him to be God and the son of the Blessed One, and they chose for themselves to die for him. Their leader said many things against us and insulted us, and I commanded that all of their important figures be

28 The Ma'dayê (or Ma'add) were a confederation of tribes in central Arabia: see Shahîd 1995, 160–6, Robin 1996, 694–5, idem 2008, 173–4.

29 As Witakowski 1996a, 54 n.278, points out, the reference to the Romans rejecting Christ is a reference to the support of Chalcedon under Justin I: we are dealing with anti-Chalcedonian polemic here. See van Rompay 1982, 307–8 and Witakowski 1993, 65.

30 The king of the Himyarites here referred to is Dhu Nuwas, also known as Masruq in some sources. See Rubin 1989, 390, on his various names, cf. Fiaccadori in Berger 2006, 61 n.85. He came to the throne in 517 (by the early chronology) or 522 (by the late). His vigorous persecutions naturally had a political dimension, aiming to strengthen his rule and eliminate Ethiopian (Christian) influence in Himyar: see Shahîd 1964, 123–8.

31 These initial executions took place, as is clear from the 'new letter', at Zafar, which was the royal city of the Himyarites rather than Najran, cf. Witakowski 1996a, 54 n.280.

32 Cf. *Mart. Areth.* 5 and Shahîd 1971, 46 (tr.): according to the 'new letter' there were two bishops of this name in turn of Najran, both consecrated by Philoxenus. The reference here is to the first one of this name.

killed, and we brought out their wives and said to them, ‘Renounce,’ seeing the execution of their men for the sake of Christ, and to have mercy on their sons [66] and daughters.³³ We put pressure on them, but they were not willing, and the daughters of the covenant³⁴ strove to be put to death first, and the wives of the important figures were angry with them and said, ‘It is right for us to die after our husbands!’ All of them were killed at our command, except Rumi, the wife of the one who was to become king there.³⁵ We did not let her die, but we demanded of her to renounce Christ and live, having pity on her daughters, and keeping possession of all that she had when she became a Jew. We commanded her to go and consider the matter, accompanied by guards from our army. She went out, going through the streets and squares of the city with her head uncovered, this woman whom no one had seen in person in public since she had reached maturity, crying out and saying, ‘Women of Najran, my Christian friends, and the rest of the Jewish and pagan women, hear me! You know my birth and my family, and whose Christian daughter I am, that I have gold, silver, slaves, many maidservants, villages and revenues. Now that my husband has been killed for the sake of Christ, if I want a husband, I have forty thousand *denarii* and gold jewelry, considerable silver, pearls and fine and radiant clothing besides the treasure of my husband. You know from yourselves that what is said by me is not out of falsehood, and that there is no time of joy for a woman like the days of her marriage, for from then on there are troubles and laments, from the begetting of children until she is deprived of them and buries them. [67] From today on I am free from all of these things. During the time of my first marriage feast I was joyous, and now with the clarity of my mind I have adorned my five virgin daughters³⁶ for Christ. Look at me, my friends, [my face]³⁷ you see now for the second time, first at my wedding banquet and on this second [occasion]. It was with my face exposed that I

33 Details of the martyrdoms are discussed in Shahîd 1971, 113–28, comparing both the old and new letters. The latter adds further details that presumably reached Simeon subsequently.

34 I.e. a community of virgins who led a religious life, on whom see Witakowski 1996a, 55 n.286.

35 The ‘new letter’ of Simeon provides more precision here. Rumi was a relative of Harith (Arethas), not his wife (as is stated below): see Shahîd 1971, 82–3. See Brock and Harvey 1987, 108 n.16 and Detoraki 2007, 212 n.79, on variant forms of the name with Binggeli, *ibid.*, 170–1: in the Arabic version she is called Dahdar, daughter of Arma’.

36 Probably an exaggeration: *Mart. Areth.* 10 refers to two daughters, whereas Guidi’s version refers to just one daughter and one grand-daughter. See Detoraki 2007, 28.

37 From MSS and BL Add. 14,641, omitted from Michael the Syrian, added by Assemani and Guidi.

entered before you all to my first groom, and now with my face uncovered I go to Christ, my Lord and my God and the God of my daughters, just as he bent down in his love, and came to us and suffered for us. Imitate me and my daughters, and consider that I am not inferior to you in beauty. I go to Christ my Lord radiant in that beauty, undefiled by the denial of the Jews, so that my beauty shall be the witness before my Lord, that [the king] was not able to lead me astray into the sin of denial, and that all of my gold and my silver and all that I have I do not love as I love my God. This rebellious king has attempted to persuade me to renounce [Christ] and live. Far be it from me, my friends, far be it from me to renounce Christ God, in whom I have come to believe! I and my daughters have been baptised in the name of the Trinity, and I worship his cross. I and my daughters will die with joy for him, just as he suffered in the flesh for us. I give up all that is pleasing to the eye and to the body on the earth, that which passes away, to go and receive from my Lord the thing that does not pass away. Congratulations to you, my friends, if you hear my words and know the truth, and love Christ for whom my daughters and I will die. Then [68] may the people of God have peace and tranquillity. May the blood of my brothers and sisters who have been killed for Christ become a wall for this city, if it clings to Christ my Lord. Now I go forth from this city with my face uncovered, in which I have been as though in a temporary dwelling, to go with my daughters to the eternal city, for there I have betrothed them. Pray for me, my friends, that Christ my Lord accept me and pardon me for having remained alive for three days after my husband.³⁸

c. When we heard the voice of wailing from the city, and those who were sent came, they were asked and said to us that Rumi was going about in the city speaking to the women, her friends, just as we have written above, encouraging them, and there was wailing in the city. We became furious with the guards so that we would have destroyed them for allowing her to do what she did, had we not been persuaded [to relent]. Finally she left the city like a mad woman, her head uncovered, with her daughters, and shamelessly came and stood before me, holding her daughters with her hands, who were dressed up as though for a wedding. She loosened the braids of her hair, swept them around with her hands, stretched out her neck and bowed her head, shouting, 'I and my daughters are Christians, and we die for Christ! Cut off our heads so that we can go to travel to our brothers and sisters, and the father of my daughters!' After all this insanity I tried to convince her to deny Christ, to say that he was only a human being, but she would not, and

38 For a few remarks on Rumi's description of her life see Brock and Harvey 1987, 21–2.

one of her daughters insulted us because we said this. Since I saw that it was impossible that she would deny Christ, in order to terrify the other Christians I commanded [69] them to throw her on the ground, her daughters' throats were cut, their blood ran into her mouth, and then her head was cut off. By Adonai,³⁹ I swear that I was very much distressed because of her beauty and that of her daughters. It seemed to the chief priests and to me that it was not right for the sons to die on account of the fathers, according to the force of the law, and so I distributed the boys and girls among the army to raise them. When they grow up, if they are Jews, they will live, but if they confess Christ, they will die. These things I have written and make known to Your Majesty, exhorting you not to tolerate a Christian among your people, unless he denies [Christ] and becomes one of you; also, My Brother, treat my brothers the Jews who are under your authority with kindness, and send me in writing what you want me to send to you in exchange for this.⁴⁰

d. All of these things were written to him as we arrived there.⁴¹ His army assembled and the letter was read aloud before him. The messenger related how the Christians were killed and were persecuted in the land of the Himyarites. Mundhir said to the Christians of his army, 'You have heard what happened. Deny Christ, for I am no better than the other kings who have persecuted the Christians.' A certain man who was a commander in his army and a Christian was moved with zeal. With courage he said to the king, 'We did not become Christians in your time so that we should deny him.' Mundhir became angry and said, 'Do you dare to speak in my presence?' He said, 'Because of the fear of God I speak without fear, and no one will stop me, because my sword is no shorter than that of others, and I will not shrink from fighting to the death.' On account of his family and because he was an important and renowned man and was courageous in battle, [70] Mundhir was silent.⁴² When we returned to Hirta de-Nu'man on

39 Hebrew 'my Lord,' a term of address used for the deity to avoid pronouncing the divine name Yahweh.

40 See Rubin 1989, 401–2, on the importance of Dhu Nuwas' Judaism: he was a genuinely independent ruler determined to build an international coalition to strengthen his position, cf. van Esbroeck 1992, Bosworth 1999, 191 n.486.

41 Thus ends Dhu Nuwas' letter to Mundhir, which comprises the first part of Simeon's letter. Simeon then goes on to relate the reaction of Mundhir's followers, and then turns very quickly to further events in southern Arabia, news of which was brought to him by a man from Hira (n.24) despatched there by the Christian messenger of the Himyarites. See Detoraki 2007, 19, for an elucidation of this structure.

42 Mundhir's call to the Christians in his following to give up their faith is plausible, but hardly in such terms as PZ relates. See Shahîd 1995, 722–6, on the Christian elements in Mundhir's kingdom; whether or not he had converted to (Nestorian) Christianity earlier in

the first Sunday of the Fast,⁴³ we found a Christian messenger who was sent from the king of the Himyarites before he died. When he heard about those who had been put to the sword by this Jewish tyrant, he immediately hired a man from Hirta de-Nu‘man whom he sent to Najran to bring him a reply. When he saw and learned about the things that had happened there, he then returned and also told the first messenger in our presence the things that have been written above, and that three hundred and forty leading figures were killed who had come out from the city to him, to whom he had sworn an oath, but he [then] played false with them; [and the messenger reported] about their leader Harith the son of Khannab, Rumi’s husband,⁴⁴ whom that Jew had insulted and said to him, ‘You have become confident in Christ in order to rebel against me, but have mercy on your old age and deny him, otherwise you will die with your friends.’ He replied, ‘I am truly distressed for all of my friends and my brothers, because they did not listen to me when I told them that you were lying, and that we should not go out to you or trust your words, but should fight you. I was confident in Christ that I would defeat you, and the city would not be captured, because it lacked nothing. You are not a king but a liar! I have seen many kings, who are truthful and are not liars. I will not deny Christ my God to become a Jew and a liar like you! Now I know that he loves me; I have lived long in the world, and I have sons, grandsons, daughters and a large family. I have been valiant in battles with the strength of Christ, and it is true for me, that like a pruned vineyard that bears much fruit, our people the Christians will increase in this city, [71] and expand and rebuild the church that burned down because of you;⁴⁵ and Christianity will gain power, and command kings, and rule, whereas your Judaism will be extinguished, your kingdom will pass away, and your authority will end. Do not boast that you have done anything, or arrogantly gloat.’

his reign, as Shahîd 1971, 369–72, argues, is doubtful. Grillmeier ii.4, 320–1/313–14 rightly insists that it was only at the end of the sixth century that the Nasrids (Lakhmids) converted to Christianity, cf. n.71 below. Shahîd 1964, 119, suggests that the chief who opposed Mundhir was Zayd ibn-Ayyub, one of the participants at the conference of Râmallâh, a leading noble of the Lakhmid confederation. Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 140, cf. 145, alludes to conversions (to Miaphysitism) among the Nasrids by Simeon; see Shahîd 1995, 727–8.

43 Simeon and his companions returned to Hira in the week of 18 February (if in 524) or in that of 11 February (if in 519), in which Lent began. On this section of Simeon’s letter, based on what he heard at Hira, see Shahîd 1971, 117–21.

44 Harith was the son of Ka‘b, not Khannab, as PZ’s text gives it: see Shahîd 1971, 75, idem 1979, 80. For more detail on his father’s name see Detoraki 2007, 202 n.66.

45 See Facciadori in Berger 2006, 52–4, on the churches of Najran, including one dedicated to St Arethas.

e. When the honourable old man, the great Harith son of Khannab said these things, he turned around and said in a loud voice to his believing friends who surrounded him, 'Did you hear, my brothers, what I said to this Jew?' They said, 'We have heard everything that you said, our father.' Then he said, 'Are they true or not?' They cried out, 'They are true!' He said, 'If someone is afraid of the sword and denies Christ, let him be separated from among us.' They cried out, 'Far be it from us! Be strong, our father, all of us are like you and we will die with you for Christ! None of us will remain after you!' He called out and said, "The nations surrounding me, the Christians, the pagans, and the Jews, have heard. If anyone from my tribe, or one of my relatives, or my family denies Christ and joins this Jew, he has no part with me, and he will not inherit anything from what is mine, but everything that I have will be for the maintenance of the church that will be rebuilt. If anyone of my family does not deny Christ and survives, he will inherit after me my property, but three fields which have been selected by the church from my property will be for its maintenance.' When he had said these things, he turned to the king and said, 'I renounce you and anyone who denies Christ. See, we are standing before you!' And his friends were encouraged, saying, 'Abraham, the head of the patriarchs, is watching you and us with you! All who deny Christ and remain alive after [72] you will be renounced by him!' The king commanded that they bring them to the ravine that is called Wadiyya,⁴⁶ to have their heads cut off, and their bodies thrown into it. They raised their hands to heaven and said, 'Christ our God, come to our assistance, and give us strength and receive our souls! May the blood of your servants that is poured out for you be pleasing to you. Make us worthy of your sight, and confess us before your father, just as we have confessed. Let your church be rebuilt and let there be a bishop in place of your servant Paul whose bones were burnt,' then they took leave of one another, and the old man Harith gave the sign to them. He bent his neck and received the sword, and his friends ran and crowded around to smear themselves with his blood, and all of them were martyred.

f. A three-year old boy, whose mother was coming out to be killed and was holding him in her hand, ran when he saw the king who was seated and clothed in the clothing of the kingdom, and, leaving his mother, he ran and kissed the king on his knees. The king held him and began to caress him affectionately and said to him, 'What would you like, to go and die with

46 The gully 'called Wadiyya': this may be a specific wadi or a rendering of the Arabic term 'wadi'. See Shahîd 1971, 81–2, but cf. Witakowski 1996a, 60 n.298, noting a variant reading in the 'new letter', *lwdy*).

your mother, or to remain with me?’ The boy said to him, ‘My lord, I want to die with my mother, and for this reason I will go with my mother, who said to me, “Come, my son, let us go and die for Christ.” Let me go so that I can go to my mother, otherwise she will die and I will not see her, because she said to me, “The king of the Jews commanded that all who do not deny Christ will die,” and I do not want to deny him.’ [The king] said to him, ‘From where do you know Christ?’ The boy said to him, ‘I see him every day in church [73] with my mother, when I go to church.’ He said to him, ‘Do you love me or your mother?’ Again he said to him, ‘Do you love me or Christ?’ He said to him, ‘Christ is greater than you.’ He said to him, ‘Then why did you come and kiss my knees?’ The boy said to him, ‘I thought that you were the Christian king whom I saw in church. I did not know that you are a Jew.’ He said to him, ‘I will give you nuts, almonds, and figs.’ The boy said to him, ‘No, Christ, no, I will not eat the nuts of Jews! Let me go so I can go to my mother!’ He said, ‘Stay with me, and you will become my son.’ The boy said, ‘No, Christ, no, I will not stay with you, because your breath stinks, and is not sweet like my mother’s.’ The king said to those nearby, ‘Come here and see this evil root, whom Christ has led astray from his youth to make him love him!’ One of the nobles said to the boy, ‘Come with me and I will bring you away to be a son for the queen.’ The boy said, ‘A slap on your cheek! I prefer my mother to the queen because she takes me to church!’ When he saw that they were restraining him, he bit the king on the thigh and said, ‘Let me go, evil Jew, so that I can go to my mother and die with her!’ He gave him to one of the nobles and said, ‘Take care of him until he grows up, and if he denies Christ he will live, otherwise, he will die.’ When one of the man’s slaves was taking him away, he kicked with his feet and cried to his mother, ‘My mother, come take me so I can go with you to church!’ Shouting over to him she said, ‘Go, my son, you are entrusted to Christ’s care, do not weep. Wait for me in the church with Christ until I come,’ and when she had said this, they cut off her head.⁴⁷

g. [74] On account of this letter and the reports that have been heard, the Christians here are in distress, and so that what happened in the territory of the Himyarites to the pious and believing bishops might become known, we have written so that people commemorate these heroic martyrs. We

47 Further details of the life of this boy who resisted Dhu Nuwas’ blandishments are narrated by John of Ephesus and preserved in PD ii, 67–8/62–3, cf. the ‘new letter’ in Shahid 1971, 53. His name was Baysar and he later came to Constantinople on an embassy to Justinian, where he met John of Ephesus. See also Detoraki 2007, 21–2, noting differences in the account of the *Mart. Areth.* 21–2 with 244 n.133.

exhort Your Charity that as soon as these things are known to the abbots and bishops and especially to the archbishop of Alexandria, he should write to the king of Ethiopia immediately to prepare to help the Himyarites, and the chief priests of the Jews in Tiberias should be arrested, and they should be forced to send [word] to this Jewish king who has appeared to stop the trial and persecution in the land of the Himyarites.⁴⁸ The rest of the letter consists of greetings to the archbishops and bishops of that time, and to the faithful abbots.⁴⁹

a. The fourth chapter of the eighth book gives information concerning the waters that entered Edessa, and [reports] that the flow of water from the Siloam in Jerusalem was stopped, Antioch was toppled, and the temple of Solomon in the city of Ba'albek was burned.

Asclepius the son of Malohê, who was the brother of Andrew and Demosthenes the *hyparchus*, became [bishop in] Edessa,⁵⁰ succeeding Paul, who was in appearance orthodox. This man [Paul] was a showy person and cultivated. While he was bishop in Edessa before Asclepius in the days of Flavian he wrote a tract which did not anathematise the council [of Chalcedon] because he had been his *syncellus*. This tract came into the hands of the holy Severus, who succeeded Flavian: when he went up [to Antioch] to greet him, [75] this Paul gave it to him, and in divine love he [Severus] forgave him his offence. This was so long as he confessed

48 Simeon here explains his motives for communicating the bad news to his correspondent. Through Timothy, the patriarch of Alexandria, he hopes to persuade the Ethiopians to intervene in Himyar, which they did in 525. See also *Mart. Areth.* 27 on the repercussions of Simeon's letter, with Vasiliev 1950, 294–5. On the (successful) Ethiopian intervention, in which the Roman fleet participated, see Shahîd 1971, 220–6, Rubin 1989, 390–2, Greatrex 1998, 230–1. Simeon also believes that pressure can be exerted on Dhu Nuwas through the Jewish community in Tiberias; the 'new letter' reports that Jewish priests from Tiberias took part in the assault on Najran and the deception of the Christians there (Shahîd 1971, 45, cf. 119). See Shahîd 1964, 123–4, for further evidence of connections between the Jewish communities in Tiberias and southern Arabia, with van Esbroeck 1992, de Lange 2005, 410–11, and Detoraki 2007, 18.

49 PZ suppresses more details at his disposal here, as Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 20, note (cf. PD ii, 67/62). Van Esbroeck 1992, 26, offers a French translation of the final section of Guidi's letter, which offers more details on Jewish activities and even on collaboration between some Christians and the Jews.

50 This Asclepius, whom PZ alone calls Bar Malohê ('son of sailors', a soubriquet he shared, according to Mich. Syr. ix.16 [272c/179], with the patriarch Euphrasius, cf. AK 355), was a member of an important aristocratic family. See *PLRE* ii, Asclepius 6, Demosthenes 4, Andreas 8. Demosthenes was praetorian prefect in 521, then later in 529; in 531 he was among various nobles sent to the East to shore up defences. Asclepius held the see from 521 to 27 June 525. See also n.55 below, Jansma, 1965, 194–5, Menze 2008a, 113, 118–19.

that he was faithful, and this wise man, who kept cognizance hidden, as it is written,⁵¹ did not expose him because of what he had written. At first he refused to accept the Council during the time of this emperor [Justin], while the Edessenes were supporting him, and day after day they suffered loss and outrage on account of him.⁵² However, when he was banished to Euchaïta, he relented, and returned to Edessa.⁵³ Shortly thereafter he was struck with shame and immediately died,⁵⁴ and Asclepius succeeded him. He was a Nestorian, but was just in his actions, and loved the peasants and was gentle towards them, and was not greedy for bribes, and he was chaste in body. He helped the church considerably in outward matters and paid its debts. Yet he was active and harsh against the believers, and many were persecuted by him and abused with every suffering,⁵⁵ or died under torture

51 Proverbs 10.14.

52 PZ's ambivalence to Paul is comprehensible, given the churchman's volte-face during his exile in Euchaïta (see below). Both *Chr. Ede.* 88–91 and PD ii, 24–5/25–6, offer greater detail on the deposition of Paul and his replacement by Asclepius. A letter of encouragement from Jacob of Serug to Paul confirms their accounts: see Martin 1876, 268–9/273–4, Jac. Ser. *ep.* 32 (241–6/316–22). Cf. Vasiliev 1950, 234, with a translation of parts of the letter, and the detailed comments of Jansma 1965, 495–8, Menze 2008a, 113. Paul became bishop of Edessa in 510 and consistently sought to tread a middle course, accepting the *Henoticon*, but refusing to condemn Chalcedon outright; consequently, especially after his restoration in 519, he was regarded with suspicion by hard-line anti-Chalcedonians. For a convincing and detailed analysis of his position see Jansma 1965, 204–26, accepting PZ's information about his failure to condemn the council explicitly (against Peeters 1948, 185–6, who dismisses PZ's account), cf. Menze 2008b, 423–4.

53 According to *Chr. Ede.* 88, Patricius removed Paul from Edessa by force in 519 as part of Justin's wide-ranging measures against opponents of Chalcedon (on which see below). Upon hearing of the brutality of Paul's eviction, Justin promptly allowed him to return. When he continued to refuse to accept Chalcedon, he was exiled to Euchaïta in July 522. PD ii, 25/26, claims that Paul had intended to consecrate Asclepius as bishop of Carrhae, and that only when this appointment failed to materialise did Asclepius then ensure the authorities in Constantinople were made aware of Paul's anti-Chalcedonian position. The *magister militum* Farzman thereupon removed Paul to Euchaïta. See Vasiliev 1950, 233, Jansma 1965, 210–26, Greatrex 2007b, 288, Menze 2008b, 424–5.

54 Paul was restored to his see, having accepted Chalcedon, on 8 March 526. He died on 30 October of the same year. See *Chr. Ede.* 91–2, Vasiliev 1950, 238, Jansma 1965, 195, Menze 2008b, 425.

55 PZ's verdict on Asclepius is remarkably generous: a far less positive assessment is offered by PD ii, 26/26. By 'Nestorian' PZ of course means 'Chalcedonian'. Both PZ and PD state that he was brutal in his persecutions of the Miaphysites; according to PD, he was encouraged by Paul ('the Jew'), patriarch of Antioch. *Chr. Ede.* 90 states that on the day following his consecration, 24 December 521, he began to expel the monks opposed to Chalcedon. See Vasiliev 1950, 236–9, Jansma 1965, 204–5, Segal 1970, 96, Menze 2008a, 113–14.

at the hands of Liberarius the Goth, a harsh governor, who was nicknamed 'The Bull-Eater'.⁵⁶

b. After these things had taken place in Edessa, in the year 836 of the Greeks, in the third [indiction], on the twenty-second of April, the waters of the River Daiṣân, which enter and pass through the city, filled up and overflowed, and ruined two sides of the wall, and drowned many because it was dinner time, and the flood waters of the Daiṣân overwhelmed them while food was in their mouths, but Asclepius and Liberarius escaped.⁵⁷

c. The flow of the water from Siloam which is on the south side of Jerusalem was stopped for fifteen years,⁵⁸ and the temple of Solomon in the city of Ba'albek in the region of the forest of Lebanon [was burnt], which the Book mentions was built by Solomon and where he stored weapons.⁵⁹

56 Only PZ refers to a Liberarius, *dux* (of Osrhoene), here and at ix.6. Here (75.16–17) he is termed a *medabbarana qashya*, while at ix.6d he is *dux*; since PZ does not here use the Greek *hêgemôn* for governor, the term should not be seen as a precise one and thus could equally refer to a military commander, such as a *dux*. As noted above (n.53), PD associates the implementation of the persecutions rather with the *magister militum* Farzman (ii, 27–8/27–8). An identification with the general Libelarius mentioned by Proc. Wars i.11.23 is possible: PLRE ii, Libelarius, following Stein 1949, 272 n.2, favours the identification and considers Libelarius later to have become *magister militum per Orientem* from 527 until his replacement by Belisarius in 529. No source, however, attests this rank for Libelarius, and a better solution is possible: see n.34 below on ix.2. Whether he was a Goth or not remains uncertain, since Syriac sources sometimes use the term simply to mean 'soldier', as Menze 2008a, 120 n.55, points out.

57 The flood overtook Edessa on 22 April 525, as PZ states: see Hallier 1892, 128–30, Stein 1949, 241, Palmer 1988, 120–2, Meier 2003, 658 and n.24, Telelis 2004, no.128. PD ii, 44–7/41–3 offers far greater detail than PZ, cf. Chr. Ede. 90–1, noting, as does PD ii, 46–7/43, the flight of Asclepius from the city: the populace blamed him for the flood. See also Mich. Syr. ix.16 (271b/180), Elias Nis. 119/57, who puts the number of dead at 30,000, while Proc. Aed. ii.7.5 estimates the dead at one-third of the population; cf. Vasiliev 1950, 350–1, Segal 1970, 187–90.

58 Cf. Cyr. Scyth. V. Sab. ch.66–7, 167–9, for the prolonged drought in Palestine and the drying up of numerous springs, including that of Siloam. Siloam itself is a pool in Jerusalem that features in the New Testament: see ODCC, 1500. This is Telelis 2004, no.126, cf. nos.122–3 and Stathakopoulos 2004, no.85. According to Cyril, the drought ended in September 520, having lasted over four years. There is some chronological confusion in Telelis' work here, partly stemming from Patlagean 1977, 76, who dates this notice of PZ (citing, however, Mich. Syr. ix.16 [271a/179], who actually offers a date of 524/5) to 529, implying a terminus of this drought only in 544; Telelis 2004, 197–8, notes that others place the start of the drought in 523. It seems more plausible to identify PZ's reference with Cyril's and to suppose that he is referring to the end of fifteen years of drought (if PZ is not exaggerating) in 520, a date clearly established by Cyril. See also Greatrex 2009, 42, suggesting PZ's use of a Syriac source shared by Theophanes here.

59 1 Kings 9.18–19.

To the south of it are three wondrous stones, [76] on which nothing is built, but they stand on their own, joined and fastened together and touching one another, and the three of them are known for their effigies, and are very large. It is as if they are placed in an omen as a temple of knowledge of the faith in the worshipped Trinity, and of the calling of the nations through the preaching of the announcement of the gospel. Lightning came down from heaven while it drizzled; it struck the temple and pulverised the stones with its heat, and knocked over its pillars, smashing it into pieces and destroying it, but it did not touch the three stones. They remain pristine, and now a house of prayer has been built there, to Mary the holy virgin birthgiver of God.⁶⁰

d. Afterwards, in the fourth [indiction], Antioch was toppled by an unusually big earthquake.⁶¹ Endless myriads of people died there, for it was summertime, and while they were drinking and food was in their mouths their ceilings collapsed upon them like on the children of Job in the [story of] Satan's testing.⁶² Euphrasius, who was archbishop there, who had succeeded Paul who was called 'the Jew,' fell into a boiling cauldron of wax and died.⁶³ Ephraem of Amida succeeded him, who was at that time the *comes Orientis*. This man in the leadership that he exercised in various places was just in his actions, and was not greedy for bribes, and was wise and successful, but for years he was ill with the teaching of the Dyophysites, from the writings of the party of Diodore and Theodore that his mother Maka had inherited from someone called Bar Shaluma of Tella (Constantia). He corrupted [77] and won over many, some by acuity and humility, and others by the threats

60 The destruction of the pagan temple at Heliopolis/Baalbek is recounted in greater detail, and with differing emphasis, by PD ii, 129–31/116–17. PD places the event in AG 866 = A.D. 554/5, but following an account of theological negotiations in Constantinople that are likewise dated much too late; see Stein 1949, 242 n.1. In fact, the destruction at Heliopolis must have occurred around this time, i.e. 526. Whereas PD dwells upon the burning of the temple and the blow it represented to the pagans, PZ focuses on the three remarkable stones that survived, followed by Mich. Syr. ix.16 (271–2a/179). On the continuing strength of paganism at Ba'albek see Eißefeld 1950, 1115–17, Rochow 1978, 231–2; despite even this destruction, pagans remained active at least until 579.

61 Antioch was largely destroyed in an earthquake during the night of 29–30 May 526, i.e., as PZ says, in indiction 4; Mal. claims that as many as 250,000 perished, 17.16. See also PD ii, 47–51/44–7, Evagr. iv.5, both drawing on Mal., with Stein 1949, 242 n.3 and Meier 2003, 659, for a full list of sources. On the extent of the destruction see Downey 1961, 521–3; PZ passes over the fire that had destroyed much of the city already in October 525.

62 Job 1–2.

63 On the death of the patriarch Euphrasius see n.13 above.

of the emperor who favoured him, and heeded the things that Ephraem wrote to him.⁶⁴

a. The fifth chapter of the eighth book gives information concerning the negotiations that took place at the border, and concerning Mundhir, the king of the Ṭayyayê, who went up into the region of Emesa and Apamea, and took a large number captive whom he brought down with him, and concerning the faithful bishops of the East who were expelled and left their churches.

Kavadh, the king of the Persians, was asking constantly and pressing the demand for a tribute [of] five hundred *centenaria* of gold that should be delivered to him by the emperor of the Romans for the expense of the Persian army guarding the gates facing the Huns.⁶⁵ For this reason, he would send his own Ṭayyayê into Roman territory from time to time, to plunder and take captives; *accordingly Mundhir the Ṭayy went up and took captives in the whole territory of the limes, being the area of the Balikh and Khabur rivers.*⁶⁶ The Romans also invaded and struck Arzanene, which was his

64 Ephraem, a former *comes Orientis*, became patriarch in April or May 527; see Stein 1949, 242 and n.4. PZ's praise for his uprightness is substantiated by his election to the office, by popular acclaim, on which see Evagr. iv.6 with Whitby 2000a, 204 n.15: he had played a leading role in looking after survivors in the aftermath of the earthquake, see Lebon 1914, 198, Downey 1961, 524–6. PZ is well informed of Ephraem's background, as one might expect, given his Amidene connections. Nothing more is known of Maka or Bar Shaluma of Constantia; his brother John was also an important official, cf. PD ii, 40/38 with Menze 2008a, 119 (surprisingly not in *PLRE* ii). On Diodore (of Tarsus) and Theodore (of Mopsuestia), see PZ iii n.25. Ephraem's doctrinal writings are discussed in detail in Lebon 1914, 203–13 and Grillmeier ii.3, 359–73.

65 PZ rightly reports Kavadh's repeated demands for funds from the Romans; these had earlier led to the outbreak of war in 502. There are no grounds, however, for his portrayal of the 500 lbs. of gold as a tribute owed by the Romans to the Persians on a regular basis. On the linking of such payments to the defence of the Caucasus, see Greatrex 1998, 14–16.

66 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.16 (270–1a/178). *Chr.* 724, 143/14, reports a raid of Mundhir in AG 830, i.e. 518/19. See Greatrex 1998, 131 n.30, for a full discussion and references, cf. Shahîd 1971, 242. Given the reference below (see n.70) to a second raid of Mundhir, we may infer that this sentence was omitted by the copyist by accident. Whether the raid described by PZ/Mich. Syr. should be identified with the one placed by the chronicles in 518/19 or with a further incursion in the mid-520s is unclear: PZ's reference to intermittent raids cautions against the idea of conflating raids reported in different sources. Shahîd 1995, 43–5, taking the sources at face value, argues for raids in both 519 and 520, cf. Beaucamp et al. 1999–2000, 51. If the Roman raids mentioned by PZ are identified with counter-attacks by Sittas and Belisarius in Persarmenia described by Proc. Wars i.11.20–1 and an assault on Nisibis (Proc. Wars i.11.23, cf. PZ ix.1) in 526, then Mundhir's raid is likely to have occurred c.525. See further Greatrex 1998, 147–8 and note Mal. 17.20, where he describes the re-appointment of Hypatius as *magister militum per Orientem* 'to protect the eastern regions from Saracen

territory,⁶⁷ and the area of Nisibis. Therefore negotiations took place, and the two kings sent [envoys]: Justin [sent] Hypatius and the old man Farzman; and Kavadh his *spahpat*.⁶⁸ At the border regions many things were discussed, which were reported to the two kings by their chief representatives through couriers. Nothing relating to peace was confirmed by them; rather they became one another's enemies.⁶⁹ Mundhir, the king of the Tayyayê, went up once or twice to Emesa, Apamea, and the country of Antioch,⁷⁰ and he led away many and brought down [78] with him four hundred virgins who were suddenly carried into captivity from the assembly of the apostle Thomas in Emesa, whom he sacrificed in one day for the worship of 'Uzzai.⁷¹ Also Dodo the anchorite, an old man who was taken into exile from the assembly, saw it with his eyes and told me.⁷² Of the bishops of the East and especially

incursions', implying that they had recently proved troublesome. The area alluded to by PZ/ Mich. Syr., which he refers to as *limiton/limes*, precisely constitutes the frontier zone.

67 I.e. Kavadh's own lands: there were royal estates in this region, on which see PZ ix.6a.

68 Probably the *spahbadh*. See Greatrex 1998, 136, 104 n.86 on this office.

69 These negotiations probably took place between April and June 527: see Greatrex 1998, 138, 148. They are to be distinguished from the talks described by Proc. *Wars* i.11.24–30, which occurred in 525/6; so Greatrex 1998, 135–8. See also Boerm 2007, 313–25, on 'hawks', like Hypatius, among Roman negotiators.

70 Shahîd 1995, 44 argues for an emendation of the Syriac text here, suggesting we read 'for the second time' instead of 'twice' (in Syriac literally 'a time and twice'). His earlier raid (n.66 above) would thus be the first one. Theophanes, here undoubtedly drawing on a fuller version of Mal., explicitly dates this incursion to March 529 (178.7–15), and Mango and Scott, 272 n.6 identify the two. Although Theoph.'s chronology is sometimes suspect, the geographical coincidence of the two raids, in particular the reference to Antioch, favours such an identification. PZ's chapter extends right up to December 531 (see below), so that there is nothing inherently implausible about a reference here to a raid in 529.

71 The reading here is uncertain. HB 207 n.2 reject Emesa as a possibility. The reference is more likely to Amis which lay, according to Mich. Syr. vii.2 (170b/12), between Chalcis and Antioch, see Honigsmann 1922, 23 no.25. The church of Saint Julian there was burnt by Adarmahan in 573, *Chr.* 724, 145.14, tr. in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 150, cf. Dussaud 1927, 428. See also Shahîd 1995, 722–6, 732–3 on this episode, suggesting some textual modifications; cf. Hainthaler 2007, 88–90, stressing Mundhir's paganism. 'Uzzai is often identified with Aphrodite, cf. Proc. *Wars* ii.28.13, where he reports how Mundhir sacrificed one of the sons of Harith to the goddess, with Henninger 1958, 734–6 (suggesting that 400 is an inflated figure), Shahîd 1995, 237–8 and M. MacDonald and L. Nehmé, *EP* vol.10 (2000), 967–8.

72 The reference to Dodo the anchorite, an eye-witness source, is intriguing. See Introduction C (3)(ix). AK 360 (cf. 289) identify this Dodo with the Dodo mentioned at i.9, a monk of Samqe near Amida, mentioned in reverential terms. Both are said to have been taken prisoner, yet the sheer distance between Amida and Antioch tends not to support an identification. AK 296, citing Behnsch 1838, 13/14–15, suggest that it was this Dodo whose marble sarcophagus was discovered after the collapse of over-hasty repairs to a church at Bet Severini/Bassibrina, a few

those in the jurisdiction of the eloquent Severus, some of them were chased out, and some of them departed for Alexandria and various other places,⁷³ travelling in the footsteps of the doctor archbishop Severus. Philoxenus of Mabbugh was sent into exile at Gangra, and was imprisoned above the kitchen in the *xenodocheion* there, and suffocated from the smoke, as he states in his letter, and finally died.⁷⁴

b. Antoninus of Aleppo (Beroea),⁷⁵ Thomas of Damascus,⁷⁶ Thomas⁷⁷ of

kilometers north-east of Qartmin, in 1474 (cf. Krüger 1938, 10, Palmer 1990, 226, and the map in Palmer 1990, xxi); this no.110 in Fiey 2004. Uncertain who this Dodo was, the monks obtained information from a Nestorian monastery dedicated to him in the Tabriz region. Our author gives no more details, although he does describe the monastery as being devoted to Dodo the anchorite, which favours the identification. Pognon 1907, 116, refers to a monastery of St Dodo or Dada at Bet Severini, cf. Bell 1911, 303–4 for a description, Mango-Bell 1982, 100–1.

73 PZ devotes the bulk of the chapter to the hardships endured by the anti-Chalcedonians in the wake of Justin's clampdown on opponents of the council. The emperor sought to rally the East to support for Chalcedon above all by depriving the Miaphysite community of its leaders. Bishops were expelled from their sees and monastic centres closed down. Ultimately this led instead to the formation of a rival church hierarchy, crystallising the division between the two sides; the effectiveness of these measures, however, must not be underestimated. See Nau 1902a, 126 (*Vit. John bar Aphthonia*, 6), Frend 1972, 247–8. On this phase of Justin's ecclesiastical policy see Vasiliev 1950, 221–39, Frend 1972, 241–54, 260–1, Frend 1973, 271–2, Maraval 1998b, 138–42, Rosen 1999, 770–1, Menze 2008a, 43–57, Menze 2008b. As Jansma 1965, 488–92, notes, there seems to have been a lull in the East between 519 and 521, during which few expulsions took place, cf. Frend 1972, 242, Menze 2008a, 56. Joh. Eph.'s *Lives* offer much detail on the fate of individuals and communities, on which see Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 68–72; PD, drawing on John's *Ecclesiastical History*, likewise provides much information, cf. van Ginkel 1995, 168–76. Menze 2008a, 235–46, rightly draws attention to John's tendency to write up these events in somewhat polarised and distorted terms, however.

74 This is the traditional account of the death of Philoxenus (Xenaias), embellished later by anti-Chalcedonian sources, who claim his suffocation was deliberate. In fact, as de Halleux 1963, 94–7, notes, PZ has almost certainly blundered in placing Philoxenus' demise in Gangra: his *Letter to the Monks of Senun* (of 521) came from Philippopolis in Thrace. Philoxenus probably stayed in Gangra in 519 en route to Philippopolis. Although PZ appears to have derived his information from the letter, he may not have had a complete version and thus wrongly inferred that it originated in Gangra. In the letter, 93–4/77–8, Philoxenus complains about his small quarters, situated above a kitchen and consequently overrun with smoke.

75 A correspondent of Severus (*Lett.* i.14–15, 63–7/57–61, 53, 167–80/151–62, *Coll.* 29, *PO* 12 [1919], 260–2), Jacob of Serug (*ep.* 4, 21–4) and bishop Thomas of Germanicia (see Menze 2008a, 157), with close connections to the civil authorities. He was expelled in 519. See *PLRE* II, Antoninus 1, Honigsmann 1951, 25–6.

76 Barheb. *CE* 197/8 refers to the rigorous asceticism of this Thomas. For a fragment of Joh. Eph.'s *Life* of him see *PO* 18 (1924), 338–9. He may be referred to in *Sev. Lett.* i.14 (63/57).

77 PZ provides more details on this Thomas at vii.6g. Both he and John of Tella were leading figures among the anti-Chalcedonian community during this period of persecution: see

Dara, John of Tella (Constantia),⁷⁸ Thomas of Amrin,⁷⁹ Peter of Resh'aina,⁸⁰ Constantine of Laodicea,⁸¹ Peter of Apamea,⁸² and the others departed, and lived secretly wherever it was convenient for them.⁸³ The see of Alexandria was not disturbed, and Timothy who succeeded Dioscorus did not depart and did not accept the Council in the time of Justin.⁸⁴ He lovingly received the faithful bishops who, having fled, were seeking refuge with him, honouring and encouraging them. Nonnus of Seleucia who was from Amida departed to his city, and he dwelled in his residence, because he was the son of rich parents, and he became a governor and an important leader of the church in his city in the time of bishop John who was from the monastery of Qartmin, a righteous man. In his time, he blessed Nonnus and said, 'My hope is in my Lord that [79] you will die a bishop on my

Vit. Ioh. ep. Tel. 60/39 and below in this chapter. According to Honigmann 1951, 104, he was expelled already in 519, although, given that John of Tella was expelled only in 521, a later date seems more plausible. See also Menze 2008a, 157.

78 Also known as John bar Qursos. Two lives of this John survive, one by Elias (perhaps the Elias mentioned below, section d), *Vit. Ioh. ep. Tell.*, the other by Joh. Eph., *Lives*, *PO* 18 (1924), 513–26. Born in 482, appointed bishop in 519, then expelled in 521, he remained a vigorous champion of the anti-Chalcedonian cause, especially in organising ordinations to the priesthood, until captured in Persian territory in 537; he also took part in the negotiations in Constantinople in 532. See Vasiliev 1950, 231, Jansma 1965, 490, Honigmann 1951, 51, Menze 2006, Menze 2008a, 55, 58, Menze 2008b, 426–7.

79 PD ii, 18/20 wrongly refers to John of Hemerion, see Honigmann 1951, 53. He was expelled in 519.

80 Banished in 519, see Honigmann 1951, 104–5; he subsequently took part in talks in Constantinople in 532. See Menze 2008a, 153.

81 A former *magister militum* and the recipient of several letters from Severus, *Lett.* i.53 (167–80/151–62), *Coll.* 90–1 (*PO* 14 [1920], 156–68); *Lett.* i.61 (214/192) also mentions him. Fragments of one of his own letters survive: see Nau 1909a, 116–17, cf. Menze 2008a, 157, on another; also Allen and van Roey 1994, 68–82, for a fragment of an address to Theodora. See Honigmann 1951, 36–8, *PLRE* ii, Constantinus 15. See also Menze 2008a, 156, on ecclesiastical canons composed in 535 by Constantine, Antoninus of Aleppo, Thomas of Damascus (probably) and two other bishops not mentioned by PZ (based on Vööbus 1975–6, vol.1, 159/154).

82 Already an isolated figure in the predominantly Chalcedonian Syria II, Peter was exiled in 519. *Sev. Lett.* i.5 (37–42/34–8) is addressed to him. For details on his period as bishop see Honigmann 1951, 57–63, Greatrex 2007b, 286–7, Menze 2008a, 45–6. He later surfaced in Constantinople in the 530s and was condemned by the council of 536: see Menze 2008a, 189.

83 For a comparable list of expelled bishops in Mesopotamia and elsewhere in the East, see PD ii, 17–18/19–20 with Honigmann 1951, 146–8 (who reconstructs the original list in Greek from the various extant Syriac sources). Some took refuge in Egypt, others near Mardê, close to the Persian frontier. See Frend 1972, 247, Menze 2008a, 151–3.

84 Justin, realising the strength of anti-Chalcedonian sentiment in Egypt, confined his initial round of persecutions to Mesopotamia and Syria. Timothy succeeded Dioscorus in 517, see Vasiliev 1950, 284, Brooks 1903.

throne,' and the event was delayed, in that after the captivity of Amida the compassionate Thomas became bishop there, he who built Dara. When the couriers came to seize him, so that either he would accept the Council or be driven out, he became sick, for which he had prayed, and from this illness he suddenly and quickly died in his see while the couriers were in his city, and this caused many to marvel. Then, in order that the blessing of John might be fulfilled, the men of Amida seized Nonnus, and they installed him there as bishop. He lived for a few more months and then passed away.⁸⁵ With the participation of three bishops according to the canons, namely Nonnus of Maipherqat (Martyropolis), Arathu of Ingila, and Aaron of Arsamosata, who happened to be present, they made Mara, the son of Qustant the governor, bishop after Nonnus.⁸⁶ Mara was the steward of the church, a man of fasting, righteous in his actions, chaste, and faithful. He was fluent and educated in the Greek language,⁸⁷ having studied in the monastery of the holy apostle Thomas, in Seleucia, which out of zeal for the faith had moved and been rebuilt and resettled in Qenneshrê on the river Euphrates⁸⁸ by the abbot John, a learned man from Edessa, the son of Aphthonia, and a former lawyer.⁸⁹

85 A letter of Severus to Nonnus survives, Sev. *Lett.* vii.4, 420–6/373–8. On his episcopacy at Seleucia Pieria, near Antioch, see Honigmann 1951, 30; his expulsion came in 519, although PZ fails to offer any chronological precision, as Jansma 1965, 485–7, notes. Cf. Menze 2008a, 49–50. See PZ vii n.94 above on how Nonnus had nearly become bishop of Amida already in 504/5 but lost out to Thomas.

86 PZ alludes here to the fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea, which laid down that if it was impossible for all the bishops of a province to elect a new bishop, then three at least should be in attendance: see PZ iv n.19. Mara was probably expelled in 521: see Maraval 1998b, 138, Menze 2008a, 49 with n.161. On the three bishops named see Honigmann 1951, 102. See also PD ii, 31/31 with Witakowski 1996a, 31 n.178, on Mara's election. On Mara in general see Menze 2008a, 54–5, cf. 119, where he rightly draws attention to this phenomenon of governors becoming bishops in Mesopotamia, cf. Rapp 2005, 203–7 more generally.

87 Joh. Eph. dedicates a *Life* to two notaries of Mara, Thomas and Stephen, PO 17 (1923), 187–213, which confirms the details recounted here by PZ, cf. PD ii, 31–2/31–2. On his position as steward, see the glossary and Menze 2008a, 119. He will have gained his education in Greek at the monastery of St Thomas (see next note), which will no doubt have furthered his (secular) career. See Menze 2008a, 139.

88 On the monastery of St Thomas at Seleucia, i.e. Seleucia ad Belum, near Chalcis, see AK 358, cf. Hoffmann 1880, 162 n.1260. Because of the persecutions in the early 520s the monks were obliged to move to Qenneshrê, which became an important centre for Greek and Syriac learning for over two centuries. See Mango 1983, 413, Vööbus 1988, 435–6, Watt 1999a, 155–6, Menze 2008a, 125–6.

89 On John bar Aphthonia (his mother's name) see Watt 1999a, esp. 155–62, Menze 2008a, 126–7. He is mentioned by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 156 with n.4, 241, 265. Some identify him with John of Bet Aphthonia, author of a biography of Severus: Watt 1999a, 162 n.27 is sceptical, whereas McVey 1993, xxii n.90, favours the identification. PZ's reference to him

This Mara was educated in every principle and virtue of the soul from his youth by Shmuni and Marutha, his sober, chaste, and faithful sisters.⁹⁰ After a short period of time in his see he was banished to Petra,⁹¹ and from Petra to Alexandria. He was there for a while and assembled a library with many wonderful books, and in them is an abundance of learning and great benefit for the diligent and discerning lovers of learning. These were transferred to the treasury of the church in Amida after the man's death. The entire account of the matter [80] I have omitted, so as not to cause outrage by blaming one or praising another; whatever the truth of the matter may be, I have recounted [it] without falsification.⁹² Nevertheless, the man progressed in reading more and more while in Alexandria, and there he fell asleep.⁹³ His body was carried [away] by his sisters who had accompanied him and who helped him, encouraging him in his distress, as it is written,⁹⁴ and they placed him in his martyrion in the village of Bet Shurla.⁹⁵ As a reminder

being an advocate, *apodikanikon*, may refer to his training in judicial oratory, even if he never underwent a formal legal training; it is unlikely that he actually studied law, as Theodore did (who is also referred to as an *apodikanikon* by PZ, vii.10d). See Watt 1999a, 161 for a full discussion.

90 These two sisters are also mentioned by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 195, PD ii, 32/31.

91 On his exile to Petra see also Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 188, who notes that Isidore, bishop of Chalcis (Qenneshrin), was with Mara there, cf. Honigmann 1951, 28. John adds that it was thanks to one of his notaries, Stephen, who visited Theodora in Constantinople, that Justinian was prevailed upon to intercede with his uncle Justin to have Mara transferred to Alexandria. Croke 2007, 41, dates Theodora's intercession to 524/5.

92 Clearly Mara's legacy was still a matter of controversy, which may have been due to the taking over of Mara's library by the Chalcedonian bishop of Amida, Abraham bar Kaili, on which see Menze 2008a, 137. Mundell Mango 1982, 6, suggests that Mara bequeathed his library to the cathedral there. It seems highly probable that PZ made good use of the library accumulated by Mara, which may well have included Zach.'s work. See Greatrex 2006, 41–2. The resources available at Alexandria, probably in the patriarchal library, were of great importance to exiled Miaphysites: we know also of a certain Thomas the Armenian, who likewise in the 520s consulted manuscripts there and returned to Belabitene in Armenia with five loads of manuscripts. See Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 293, with Flusin 1996, 39–41, Blaudeau 2006a, 362–3, Menze 2008a, 130 and n.91, 138.

93 Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 194, reports that Mara died in Alexandria after eight years of exile. Since his banishment is probably to be placed in 521, he will have died in 529. See Honigmann 1951, 100–1, Croke 2006, 35. Blaudeau 2006a, 362, places his exile c.523, however, while Menze 2008a, 213–15 with n.77, argues that John was moved from Petra to Alexandria only in 530/1, and hence his death would fall in 538.

94 Cf. 2 Corinthians 1.4.

95 On the return of Mara's remains to Amida see also Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 194–7 and PD ii, 32/32 with Witakowski 1996a, 32 n.180, on differences in the orthography of the place where they were laid to rest. Brooks in PO 17 (1923), 197 n.1, suggests that it means 'eye-film (?)'. As Menze 2008a, 163–4, notes, Abraham bar Kaili must have permitted this move, cf. *ibid.* 115 n.35.

of his eloquence and love of learning I have copied out at the end of this book the prologue, composed by him in the Greek language, written in his four-gospel book.⁹⁶

c. Even the believing inhabitants of the monasteries in the East departed and withdrew from their dwellings in the vicinity of Antioch and Euphratesia, and also Osrhoene and Mesopotamia, from the third [indiction] year until the ninth, a week of years.⁹⁷ The monastery of Thomas of Seleucia with the brotherhood was relocated and settled by the eloquent abbot John, the son of Aphthonia, to Qenneshrê on the river Euphrates.⁹⁸ Cyrus, the abbot of the monastery of the Syrians in Antioch,⁹⁹ was chased out along with the brotherhood of the monastery of Tel'eda,¹⁰⁰ and of Bazu¹⁰¹ and of Romanus¹⁰² and Simeon of Legina,¹⁰³ and Ignatius the abbot of 'Aqiba in

96 Wright 1894, 83, argues that Mara merely added a short prologue in Greek to a copy of the gospels that he had picked up in Alexandria, along with the episode from the Gospel of John (7.53–8.11) of the woman caught in adultery. Honigmann 1951, 101, is prepared to accept Mara's authorship of the whole work.

97 PZ places the period of exile of the anti-Chalcedonian churchmen from indiction 3 (524/5) to 9 (530/1). On the latter date, see n.140 below. The former date seems rather late, since some expulsions occurred already in 519, as noted above, while the provinces closer to the frontier were hit harder in 521 (e.g. with the expulsion of the monks, described below, in December 521): see Menze 2008a, 121–2. As he notes (*ibid.*, 124–44) in an important discussion of this wave of expulsions, Justin often targeted monastic leaders rather than whole monasteries.

98 See nn.88–9 above.

99 Nothing further is known of this Cyrus nor of the monastery.

100 See Honigmann 1923, no.449, for Tel'eda. Philoxenus sent two letters to this monastery from his exile, see de Halleux 1963, 192–6. It lay west of Beroea, see Vööbus 1988, 437–8, and was an important monastic centre, where Philoxenus himself had studied. See map 6 below on the location of these monasteries.

101 The text is uncertain here. There is a word before 'Romanus' in the text: the manuscript has *brw*, Mich. Syr. (ix.14 [265/171]) has *bzw*. Brooks, PZV ii, 55 n.2, suggests that *byz*' might be indicated, attested as a monastery in Wright 1871, 703–4, 706–8. See also Caquot 1958, 66, Mundell Mango 1983, map 1, who places it north of Apamea. Honigmann 1951, 179 n.1, more convincingly situates the monastery near Seleucia.

102 AK 359 note that Barheb. CE 243/4 refers to a monastery of Mar Romanus, also known as of Cassian, on the border between Palestine and Egypt. Honigmann 1922, 19 no.4, locates a monastery of Romanus in north Syria, however, which is more plausible, cf. Littmann 1922, 194, Caquot 1958, 75, Menze 2008a, 129: Proc. Aed. v.9.27 mentions a *ptôcheion* of Romanus renovated by Justinian near Apamea. The name was particularly common in Syria: see Maas 1906, 29.

103 See PZ iv.6d also for this Simeon of Legina. AK 316 place this monastery in northern Syria, interpreting its name as 'the monastery of jugs' (from the Greek *lagêna*, jug), but this identification is rejected by Honigmann 1922, 19 no.7, who places it at El-Leğine, south-west of Litarbae, cf. Littmann 1922, 187–8, Caquot 1958, 66.

Qenneshrin,¹⁰⁴ and the monastery of Senun,¹⁰⁵ and John the abbot of Kafra de Birta,¹⁰⁶ and the monastery of Mar Bassus,¹⁰⁷ and John of the Easterners¹⁰⁸ and the monks of the Arches,¹⁰⁹ and the monastery of Magus,¹¹⁰ and Sergius of Pesilta,¹¹¹ and Thomas of Bet Nesih, and Isaac of Bet 'Ebedyeshu',¹¹² and the inhabitants of the 'Arab in Mesopotamia, and Izla and Bet [81]

104 The monastery of Mar 'Aqiba was in or near Chalcis (Qenneshrin), cf. Honigmann 1951, 28 (placing it at Telhadin, not to be confused with Tel'eda), de Halleux 1963, 54. The monastery here is alluded to in Sev. *Lett.* i.37–8 (117–23/104–10).

105 Senun lay near Hierapolis (Mabbugh). It is only attested in Philoxenus' letter to its monks, cf. de Halleux, *Letter to the Monks of Senun*, vi. He places it in Euphratesia, probably to the north-east of Hierapolis, in the direction of Edessa. See also Honigmann 1922, 24–5 no.34, Littmann 1922, 190, for references to other monasteries with a similar name in the region.

106 Hoffmann, in AK 359, identifies Kafra de Birta, which AK render instead as Kefr Arbetha, with el-Bare near Apamea. Cf. Honigmann 1922, 19 no.5 (referring to a monastery of Mar Moses), Littmann 1922, 187. Menze 2008a, 132–3, proposes identifying John with the abbot of Mar Eusebius monastery at Kefra d-bârta, a figure who commissioned various manuscripts and is mentioned in one of the proceedings of the second council of Ephesus (449); see also Brock 1975, 20 (no.7), a letter from Thomas, bishop of Germanicia, to John, abbot of the monastery of Bet Mar Eusebius.

107 Cf. Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 156, 241, for further references to the monastery of Mar Bassus; the monks exchanged letters with Jacob of Serug. See Martin 1876, 217–65, Jac. Ser. *epp.* 13–17 (52–87/87–128), Jansma 1965, 350–70. De Halleux 1963, 54, places the monastery at Bitabo, just west of Chalcis, cf. Honigmann 1922, 18 no.1, Littmann 1922, 178, Caquot 1958, 66. More detail in Krüger 1938, 15–18.

108 The monastery of the Easterners (or 'Orientals' in earlier translations) lay a few miles south of Edessa, cf. Mich. Syr. ix.15 (269a/176), Segal 1970, 96, Mundell Mango 1983, 412–13. Honigmann 1922, 20–1 no.15, seems to place it in north Syria, but Littmann 1922, 188, rightly notes that there were several monasteries of this name, including the one in Edessa, probably the one here referred to, and another in Resh'aina, cf. Caquot 1958, 75. Menze 2008a, 113, notes PD's report (ii, 27–8/27–8) of expulsions in late December 522 by Asclepius (see n.55 above), but doubts whether this is to be identified with the monastery of the Easterners here mentioned (*ibid.* 122 n.61).

109 Deir d'Qubba (the monastery of the Arches) may have been located just to the south of Edessa, in the village of this name, cf. Luther 1997, 199 and n.376, so also Mundell Mango 1983, 413–14. There was also a monastery of this name to the southwest of Beroea, cf. Honigmann 1922, 21 no.17 and Littmann 1922, 192. See too Caquot 1958, 76–7.

110 Nothing further is known of the monastery of Magus (the reading is in any case uncertain).

111 Nothing further is known of this Sergius of Pesilta (of the [monastery of the] quarry). AK 360 place the monastery in the Izla mountains, cf. PZ x.12 and Barheb. CE 215/16, who state that Jacob Baradaeus is said to have originated from this place, cf. Wright 1872, 1131 (said to be near Constantia), so also Honigmann 1951, 160, Mundell Mango 1983, 415. Wright 1871, 498, on the other hand notes a monastery of Pesilta near the village of Turlaha close to Antioch.

112 Neither of these people or places is otherwise attested.

Gaugal,¹¹³ and the five metropolitan monasteries of Amida,¹¹⁴ and Ḥananya and Abraham, called ‘the Humble,’ a miracleworker, and Daniel the *chorepiskopos*¹¹⁵ of the monasteries of Edessa,¹¹⁶ and Elia of Bet Ishaquni,¹¹⁷ and Simai and Cosmas [of the monastery] of John of the Urtâyê,¹¹⁸ and Maron of the monastery of the Easterners,¹¹⁹ and Solomon of the house of Mar Samuel,¹²⁰ and Cyrus of Sugha,¹²¹ and the monks of the [monasteries of the] Watchtower and of [Bet] Tirai, which are near Resh‘aina.¹²²

d. For this reason, four or five groups of solitaries were founded in the desert. At Ramsha settled Mari,¹²³ a chaste man of an honourable way of life;

113 PZ here refers to a broad area: the ‘Arab is the area east of Constantia, see PZ vii n.22. Mount Izla is part of the Tur Abdin. Bet Gaugal constitutes part of the same region, on the south side of the mountain range: see de Halleux 1983, 7–9, Palmer 1990, 116, 146.

114 For the monasteries of Amida see Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 607–23, detailing their sufferings during this period.

115 Of Ḥananya and Cosmas nothing further is known. Among Jacob of Serug’s correspondents there was a Daniel (*ep.* 27, 225–7, *ep.* 39, 287–92) and a Jacob (*ep.* 34, 250–7), but the names are of course common. Abraham might be the same as the recluse of this name, known as ‘the consecrated’, whose life is recounted by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 118–25.

116 There was near Amida a monastery known as that of the Edessenes. See Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 221, PO 18 (1924), 391, PO 19 (1925), 209, but the plural here more likely refers to the monasteries actually at Edessa.

117 Not otherwise attested; the place is unknown, although it is mentioned again at PZ xii.7 section ‘I’. Menze 2008a, 152 n.32, notes a place called Bet Ishaq on Palmer’s enigmatic map (1990, xxi), some 20 km north of Sisauranon, right on the Persian frontier in the Tur Abdin, but in xii.7 PZ places it on the outskirts of Amida.

118 Simai and Cosmas are both mentioned in Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 222–4. The former was a native of Arzanene who was archimandrite of the monastery of John Urtâyê from 522/3 to 526/7 and led the monks during the persecution to the monastery of the poplars (on which see PZ xii n.20), cf. Brooks’ note at PO 19 (1925), 224 n.1; the latter, however, died under Anastasius, before the persecutions began, Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 221 with Brooks’ n.4. The monastery itself lay just north of Amida. See Greatrex 1998, 85 and n.37, 91 and n.52 and PZ vii n.54 above.

119 See n.108 above.

120 This may be the same community as that mentioned in vii.8a (the letter sent concerning the fall of Macedonius). PD ii, 29/29 also mentions a monastery of Mar Samuel, which was probably located north-east of Nisibis: see Krüger 1938, 37–9.

121 Otherwise unattested. Sugha might be identified with Sugga, due north of Zeugma, west of the Euphrates, on which see Dussaud 1927, 477.

122 See Honigsmann 1922, 21 no.16, Littmann 1922, 175–6, on the term *speculis* (Watchtower) here used, cf. Caquot 1958, 76–7, Mundell Mango 1983, 413, placing both monasteries near Resh‘aina. The place is also referred to at vii.6g. Procopius refers to Thiolla, identified by Dilleman 1962, 108, with Tell Taouil, south-east of Resh‘aina on the Khabur.

123 Neither person nor place is otherwise attested.

at Natpa,¹²⁴ Sergius, a plain and simple man,¹²⁵ and after him came Antony,¹²⁶ a calm and peaceful man, and Elias, the old and philanthropic man and a countryman of ours,¹²⁷ and Simeon from Qenneshrin,¹²⁸ and Sergius who now has rebuilt Sodqatha and the community that is beside Harmasha,¹²⁹ the monastery of Mar John of Haura,¹³⁰ and Simeon the abbot of Mar Isaac of Gabbula, which is now defiled with the heresy of Julian the Fantasiast, but at that time was zealous for the faith, he and those who were with him.¹³¹ There was Barnikina of the monastery of Mar Hanina, a miracle-worker who was moved with such zeal as to be brought up to the royal city to admonish and criticise the emperor in person, although he was not received.¹³² A witness to

124 The monastery of Natpa, the 'water-drop', lay just to the north of the monastery of Deir Zafaran: see Palmer 1990, 122–3, Mundell 1981, 526–7, Krüger 1938, 31–2.

125 Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 84–111, recounts the lives of Simeon, a recluse, and his disciple Sergius, cf. PD ii, 47/44. Given the vigorous way in which Sergius countered the Chalcedonian persecutions, e.g. by bursting in upon a service at Amida, it seems unlikely he can be identified with this Sergius, *contra* AK 360.

126 Not otherwise known.

127 AK 360 suggest that this Elias was the author of *Vit. Ioh. ep. Tell.*, on which see Wright 1894, 82. Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 575–6, contains fragments of a life of a wealthy individual called Elia, presumably not the author of the *Vita*, but potentially another candidate to be identified with this Elias. Since we cannot identify the Elias in question, and the term itself is very general (*bar atran*, 'son of our region'), it is unfortunately impossible to make any inferences about PZ himself (or his source).

128 The identity of this Simeon is uncertain: he cannot be the bishop of Chalcis, for he died before Justin's accession: see Honigmann 1951, 28. The reclusive Simeon noted above (n.125) is more likely to be the Simeon mentioned by PZ at the end of the chapter (section f below).

129 Neither of these two places is otherwise attested; the reading is uncertain anyway. Dillemann 1962, 53, notes that the river Mygdonius, which flows though Nisibis, the modern Jaghjagh, is also called Hirmas/Harmesh in some sources, although this is not the usual Syriac name for it. This Sergius could be the bishop of Cyrrhus expelled in 519, the recipient of Sev. *Lett.* v.15 (394–405/350–9) and *Coll.* 88, PO 14 (1920), 150–3. Along with Marion, bishop of Sura, Nonnus, bishop of Circesium, Thomas of Dara and John of Tella, he was one of the signatories of a letter opposing Julian of Halicarnassus written in the vicinity of Mardê (as Severus notes) c.530, on which see Draguet 1927a, 80–3, Honigmann 1951, 69, Vööbus 1982.

130 Neither John nor the monastery is otherwise known.

131 Gabbula lies in Syria I, west of the Euphrates. On this monastery see Honigmann 1951, 31. A long letter of Jacob of Serug to the monastery of Mar Isaac survives, *ep.* 19, 102–29. On Julian's apthartodocetist doctrine see PZ ix n.114 below. Since this Simeon is not otherwise known – save as the addressee of Simeon of Bet Arsham's letter at viii.3a above – the date of his conversion (or that of his monastery) to Julian's doctrines is uncertain. Mich. Syr.'s reference (ix.15, 267c/172) to Simeon, rather than the monastery, being polluted by Julian's doctrines is more plausible, since from the point of this expulsion the monastery was dissolved, in effect.

132 Mich. Syr. ix.15 (267c/172) gives the name as Berenicianus. Mundell Mango 1983,

this is the letter of thanksgiving of Philoxenus which he wrote to him from Gangra.¹³³ There were the monks of Mar Zakkai of Callinicum¹³⁴ and of Mar Aba,¹³⁵ and of the monastery of Requm.¹³⁶

e. So the desert was peaceful, and abounded in the population of believers who were dwelling in it, and day by day others who visited their brothers out of love in Christ, or who were chased from place to place by the bishops in the cities were added, and with their brothers they became a multitude, and became like a commonwealth [82] of illustrious and believing priests and with them the brotherhood, [dwelling in] serenity. They were united in love and abounded in affection for one another; they were beloved and accepted by everyone. There was nothing lacking, for accompanying them were the honoured heads of the body, of which they were all members. [The first of these] was the pious John of Tella, an ascetic man of fasting. He would not even partake of the desirable bread, 'the first necessity of human life.'¹³⁷ He excelled so much in his reading of books that he became one who is knowing¹³⁸ and a theoretician. For he used to carry his mind aloft in the contemplation of spiritual beings for three hours, marvelling and being in contemplation of the wisdom of God's creations, and for three more hours, from the sixth to the ninth, he was joyful and peaceful with everyone, in conversation with those who would approach him with business that would

419, puts the monastery east of Gabbula, just west of the Euphrates, although she notes that other have placed it near Chalcis, cf. Caquot 1958, 78–9.

One may compare his démarche with that of Ze'ura, related by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 21–6, who also visited the imperial capital and upbraided the emperor in the early 530s: see Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 44–5, 84. Mich. Syr. x.21 (379c/361) places the monastery of Mar Hanina between Callinicum and the Balikh, near Sura, cf. Honigsmann 1922, 31 no.84, Littmann 1922, 184. Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 156, 241, likewise refers to a house of Mar Hanina at Sura, cf. Barheb. CE 243/4, 249/50.

133 Such a letter of Philoxenus does not survive: see de Halleux 1963, 188.

134 The monastery of Mar Zakkai lay near Callinicum on the Euphrates; it was here that John of Tella was ordained, *Vit. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 45/31, Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 515; PD ii, 28/28 also mentions it. Some of the rules for the community laid down by John of Tella survive, see Vööbus 1988, 179–81 and now Menze and Akalın 2009, esp. 12–17.

135 As Palmer 1990, 22 n.6, points out, this phrase is inserted in PZV ii, 56, although the Syriac is not in PZT. The reference is found, however, in Mich. Syr. ix.14 (267/172). Palmer 1990, 21–2, identifies the monastery with one mentioned in the *Life of Samuel of Eshtin*, about 5 km south-east of Qartmin, a more plausible hypothesis than that that put forward by AK 364, who place it on the Euphrates near Samosata (citing Barheb. CE 135/6, cf. Krüger 1938, 7–8).

136 Bet Requm is referred to in Wright 1882, 721: BL Add. 14,557 once belonged to the monastery of Bet Requm.

137 Sirach 24.21.

138 Lit., 'a gnostic,' but this term does not here have its usual negative connotations.

arise. [The second one was] Thomas of Dara, who had many labours, [and] would speak at length on matters of physics.¹³⁹

f. In [indiction] year nine, in the fifth year of the reign of this present serene emperor, Justinian distributed justice, being moved by God our Lord who had foreknowledge concerning his deeds.¹⁴⁰ He ordered that all orders should return from exile and the regions to which they had departed out of zeal for the faith. He summoned the believing bishops to be brought to him and when this took place in the ninth year,¹⁴¹ many Huns invaded Roman territory in the tenth year, and massacred those whom they found outside the citites. They crossed the river Euphrates and reached as far as the region of Antioch.¹⁴² Then, in the providence of God, as he said, 'My people, enter your inner rooms, and remain hidden until my anger passes,'¹⁴³ and by order of the emperor, the faithful who were also in the East were gathered in [to safety]. John the hermit of Anastasia, a man of an honourable way of life, was killed in the wilderness by [83] the Huns, but Simeon the hermit, who was called 'the Horned,' was not harmed.¹⁴⁴

a. The sixth chapter of the eighth book lists the archbishops in the days of Justin, who reigned nine years and died in the [indiction] year five; the present Justinian, who was the son of Justin's sister, succeeded him.¹⁴⁵

139 PZ paints an idealistic picture of this community in exile; cf. Frend 1973, 271–2, and PD ii, 29/29. The two individuals named are John, bishop of Constantia (Tella), on whom see n.78 above, and Thomas, bishop of Dara, on whom see n.77 above. *Vit. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 46–7/31–2 confirms John's asceticism; see also Frend 1972, 248, Menze 2008b, 426–7.

140 Cf. PZ x.0a, where Justinian is also referred to as the reigning emperor. PZ dates the return of the monks from exile to 530/1, at least by the indiction year; the synchronisation with the fifth year of Justinian's rule is slightly astray, since it lasted from 1 April 531 to 30 March 532. Cf. PZ xii n.7 for another error of synchronism. See Greatrex 2007b, 289 n.34, Menze 2008a, 121–2, for a discussion of the chronology of the monks' return, which remains uncertain; cf. Frend 1972, 261–2. PD ii, 30/30 states that Belisarius allowed the monks to go back, which implies a date between 529 and 531, when he was *magister militum per Orientem*.

141 See PZ ix.15 on the negotiations that took place in Constantinople in 532/3, cf. Menze 2008a, 58, on the summoning of anti-Chalcedonian bishops.

142 This Hunnic invasion took place in December 531 and is narrated in greater detail at ix.6: see Greatrex 1998, 211–12.

143 Isaiah 26.20.

144 Of John or Anastasia nothing further is known, although AK 364 suggest that the latter might be identified with the city of Dara. See further PZ ix.6b below. Simeon might well be the Simeon whose life is recounted by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 84–111.

145 A comparable list may be found in PD ii, 44/47; Mich. Syr. ix.20 (276–7/189–90) is quite different, offering critical comments on certain Chalcedonian patriarchs. As noted above (vii.15), probably both PD and PZ were drawing on a similar list here. This list, however,

These are the archbishops in the time of Justin: Hormisdas of Rome,¹⁴⁶ Timothy of Alexandria,¹⁴⁷ Peter of Jerusalem, who succeeded John,¹⁴⁸ Paul of Antioch, the Jew, who was driven out, after him Euphrasius, who was burnt in the earthquake in the year four, and after him Ephraem of Amida, and Epiphanius of Constantinople.¹⁴⁹ This span of time comprises nine years.

a. The seventh chapter is the prologue that was composed concisely and with chapters by the holy Mara, worthy of blessed memory, bishop of Amida, on the gospel and the dispensation of Christ in the flesh [and a demonstration from the gospel of John in the eighty-ninth canon, in which is written uniquely concerning the woman who approached him from the teachers of the Jews who had conceived in adultery].¹⁵⁰

In order to assemble knowledge in a long treatise, one succinctly arranges the information into short sections in the mind, memory and understanding, [84] and we can understand these matters from these chapters that are written down in this book, and these things cause the meaning of all that is in them to pass immediately and concisely into the mind when they are heard and considered one after the other. For should someone assemble the record of the Gospels, he will learn from it that God became embodied, and that the divine and human properties belonged to him, by which he laid the foundations of the world, which he will clearly manifest at his second coming.¹⁵¹ Thus all who consider these things severally finds first a notice

is much less detailed than those offered at the end of vi and vii, and adds almost no new information to that at vii.15.

146 Hormisdas was bishop of Rome from 514 to 523. See PZ vii n.227 and appendix 2 below.

147 Timothy (IV) was patriarch of Alexandria from 517 to 535. See Brooks 1903, Stein 1949, 232, 380.

148 Peter was patriarch of Jerusalem from 524 to 552, having succeeded John (III) (516–24). See Stein 1949, 394, Grillmeier ii.3, 7.

149 Paul ‘the Jew’ was patriarch of Antioch from 518 to 520 (n.13 above); Euphrasius, from 521 to 526 (n.13 above), Ephraem from 527 to 545, Stein 1949, 242 and 637 and n.64 above. Epiphanius was patriarch of Constantinople from 520 to 535, cf. Stein 1949, 230–1. See also appendix 2.

150 Added from PZT ii, 91, line 10 (where it clearly got misplaced). This version is from MS V. MS A reads ‘The Seventh Chapter, in which is contained below the prologue that was written by Mara the bishop of Amida in the Greek language in the four-fold gospel book (*Tetraevangelion*).’

151 Mara’s summary of the *Tetraevangelion*, a collection of the four gospels (cf. *ODB*, 861) seems to owe most to the Gospel of John; the reference is probably to what Baumstark 1922, 21–3, calls the *Evangelium der Getrennten*, an early Syriac translation of the four gospels,

of the census that took place before his embodiment, and then the birth of John the Baptist as a testimony of the God of Israel, as it occurred through the previous annunciation of the angel. One finds the supernatural birth of Jesus, God, which took place in the virgin Mary and from her, and that every human being from the earth had a beginning, according to the saying of the Baptist,¹⁵² except Jesus, who was not from the earth but from heaven. The testimonies of his embodiment mentioned in the Gospel book were spoken through the Spirit by Elizabeth and the angel to the virgin, to Joseph, and to the shepherds, by the assembly of the watchers, and again by the prophecy of Zachariah, and the rising of the star, which manifested the incorruptible kingdom of the Son of God who was born, and by the prophecy of Simeon the priest and Anna concerning the coming of the Messiah in the good news of his birth for the salvation of the world and of Israel. Along with these, there was also the preaching of the Baptist who testified that he was from the earth, but our Saviour was from heaven. [85] Again, from the record of the Gospels one understands the divine dispensation of our Lord which took place in infinite wisdom, and not from the wisdom of the scribe or the scholar of learning, and the authority that performed powerful miracles in deed and word, and his knowledge about everything, and that he did not commit a sin. Again, it was by his will that it happened that he suffered when it was his time, and did not suffer when it was not time, and that it was in his power to dispel sufferings that are in the will and in the body, and to destroy death by his resurrection, and to ascend to heaven. The record clearly states that he was embodied from the virgin, in animate¹⁵³ and rational flesh, his human gestation was nine months, his birth was natural, though he was supernatural, and that he was swaddled and sucked milk and was circumcised according to the Law, and that he fled from the threats of Herod to Egypt, carried by his mother, and that he went up from Egypt for the renewal of Israel typologically.¹⁵⁴ Again, one learns that he grew in stature and was subject to his mother and to Joseph, her husband, and was baptised by John with water as a demonstration of the birth of regeneration for humanity, by which it is renewed as a type, because his baptism bestowed upon us

cf. Lewis Smith 1910 for an edition (from which, cf. p.xxx, the parable related at length by PZ is absent). It also unsurprisingly insists on the divine element in Christ's nature, which Miaphysites believed to be denied, or at least insufficiently appreciated, by Chalcedonians.

¹⁵² John 3.31.

¹⁵³ Syr. *napšanaya*, lit. 'having a soul.'

¹⁵⁴ See *ODCC*, 1649, on this meaning of 'type', cf. (in greater detail) Hall 2002; usually it would mean as a 'foreshadowing'. Here Christ stands for the people of Israel.

the holy birth of the Spirit. He was tempted like a human being by the Slanderer and he easily won the contest and the argument of the tempter, as God, and he was served by angels, and he gave to our race rest through our return to Paradise. He went about with his disciples as a human being, and he escaped on occasion from those pursuing him, and he was hungry, thirsty, and tired. He showed us that he did not accept these things only out of the necessity of human nature, [86] as though he were not God, by the fact that he was attested to have truly fasted for forty days, and afterwards was hungry. Likewise he also slept, but because he was on a mountain in peace, he kept vigil in prayer, and it was for the sake of humanity that he prayed like a human to the Father, but on the sea and in the storms he slept on the ship for the instruction of the disciples, so that they might believe that it was he who silenced the storms on the sea and the sound of their waves. Again, when they tried to throw him down from the side of the mountain they were not able, but while surrounding him he escaped from among them and went off. When he was wounded by the lance on the cross, his soul did not depart out of necessity, but he lifted his head and surrendered his spirit, and in every sense the divine and human qualities are his. The corrections of the world that Christ made are his rebuke of the Deceiver, the demons that he chased out, the devils that he expelled, the obstinate diseases that he healed, the dead whom he raised, the various temptations that he removed and the specific passions that he extinguished, that were types and signs of the world to come, that is far away from evil things, awaited by us with hope and love and faith. The teaching of our Lifegiver¹⁵⁵ removes human beings from the passions of the love of money and the love of glory and pleasure, and raises them up to serve God with a correct will.'

b. Inserted into the Gospel of the holy bishop Mara in the eighty-ninth canon¹⁵⁶ [87] the chapter that is only found in the Gospel of John and is not found in the other manuscripts, a section that is as follows:¹⁵⁷ 'One day while

155 Or 'Saviour'.

156 Syriac canon 89 starts at John 7:32, while canon 99 begins at John 8:10 (Gk.: 8:12) according to the Syriac system. In the Greek system, canon 89 begins at John 8:21 and canon 99 begins at John 12:9.

157 John 7.53–8.11. The parable of the woman caught in adultery is generally now accepted by biblical scholars to be an intrusion into the Gospel of John. See (e.g.) Moloney 1998, 259–65, Schnelle 1998, 150–3; also Klauck 2003, 40–1, on other sources for it, cf. Euseb. *HE* iii.39.19. It was not to be found in the Syriac version of the New Testament, the Peshitta, which is no doubt why Mara thought it worthwhile to include it here: see Becker 1963, 14–16. For detail on later Syriac versions of the story, as well as a reconstruction of the Greek text translated by Mara (or PZ), see Gwynn 1909, lxxi–lxxii, 3, 41–9, 91–2.

Jesus was teaching they brought to him a woman who was discovered to be pregnant through adultery, and they informed him concerning her. Jesus said to them, although as God he knew their shameful passions and their deeds, “What is commanded¹⁵⁸ in the Law?” They said to him, “On the testimony of two or three witnesses she will be stoned.” He replied to them, “According to the law of Moses, whoever is pure and free from this sinful passion,¹⁵⁹ and can bear witness with confidence and authority, not being guilty of this sin, let him bear witness against her, and let him be the first to throw a stone at her, then those who are after him, and let her be stoned.” Since they were subject to condemnation and were guilty of this passion of transgression, one by one they went away from him, and left the woman. When they had gone, Jesus looked at the ground, and writing in the dust said to the woman, “Those who brought you here and wanted to bear witness against you, when they understood the things that I said to them, which you have heard, they left you and went away. You also should go and henceforth do not commit this sin again.”

158 So V and Mich. Syr. ix.13 (270/178): ‘What is commanded in the law?’ Brooks in PZT ii, 87 l. 7 adopts the reading of A, ‘What does [Moses] command?’.

159 MS A: ‘these sinful passions’.

BOOK NINE

a. [87] This ninth book also concerns the reign of Justinian, recounting that he became Anticaesar¹ on the Thursday of the last week of the fast.² After he had governed for three months with Justin, his uncle, who already had died at the end of July³ [88] at the completion of [indiction year] five, Justinian became emperor⁴ in year 838 of the Greeks, in the 327th Olympiad.⁵ [It also recounts] the [events] that took place during his reign down to the [indiction year] fifteen. There is a period of ten years in the chapters of this ninth discourse that are written down below, which contains twenty-six chapters, during [which] he was reigning.⁶ These are written down below, and are as follows.

b. The first chapter of the ninth book offers instruction concerning the battle that took place in the summer of [indiction] year five around Nisibis and the Persian fortress of Tebetha.⁷ The second chapter of this book gives

1 For this term, which may mean simply 'deputy', cf. PZ vi.6e and vii.12d with n.211 (on Theoderic). On this reference (as at ix.1a) see Chrysos 1986, 77–8, Prostko-Prostyński 1994, 176 n.111.

2 That is, in the sixth week of Lent. PZ's chronology here is precise and accurate: Justinian was elevated to the throne on 1 April 527, Maundy Thursday, cf. Proc. *Anecd.* 9.53, Evagr. iv.9, Mal. 18.1. *De Cer.* i.95 (432–3) gives 4 April, on the other hand, i.e. Easter day, which is when the ceremony (in the palace) may have been performed. See Vasiliev 1950, 95–6.

3 Justin died on 1 August 527; the date is given very precisely by *Chr. Pasch.* 617. Justinian thereupon immediately became sole emperor. See Vasiliev 1950, 414, *PLRE* ii, Iustinianus 7.

4 PZ uses the formal Greek term *autokratôr* here, as at vii.1a, cf. n.4 *ad loc.*

5 Indiction year 5 is 526/7, likewise AG 838. PZ's Olympiad calculation, on the other hand, is inaccurate: see Grumel 1958, 244. 527 is year 3 of Olympiad 326 (at least on Jerome's system). Chroniclers often had difficulty with such synchronisations as they had to combine several sources: see Debié 1999–2000, 412–15, cf. van Nuffelen 2004, 58–9 (on the case of Socrates). *Chr. Pasch.* 617 makes 528 year 1 of Olympiad 327, while Jac. Ede. *Chron.* 318/240 puts Justin's death in the second year of Olympiad 326. PZ is thus ahead by two years from the correct total and one year ahead of *Chr. Pasch.*, assuming that he is referring to the first year of Olympiad 327, which he does not say explicitly.

6 The book thus covers events from 527 to 536/7 (indiction year 15), the apogee of Justinian's reign and a tumultuous time for the anti-Chalcedonian population.

7 Tebetha, also referred to as Thebetha (cf. Introduction, section E).

information concerning the battle that took place in the wilderness of Tannuris.⁸ The third chapter of this discourse gives information concerning the battle that took place around the city of Dara, which is on the frontier. The fourth chapter of the narrative gives information about the battle that occurred on the Euphrates in the ninth [indiction year]. The fifth chapter recalls Gadar the Qadishite,⁹ the Persian commander of the army, how he was killed, and [how] Izdegerd, who was with him [and] who was a son of the sister of the *ptehasha* of Arzanene, was taken prisoner. The sixth chapter gives information concerning the battle that took place at Maipherqaṭ (Martyropolis), which is on the frontier, and concerning the many Huns who crossed into Roman territory in the tenth year. The seventh chapter recalls how, in the summer of the eleventh [indiction] year there was peace between the Roman Empire and the Persians, through ambassadors Rufinus and Hermogenes, who was the *magister officiorum*. The eighth chapter of this ninth book gives information concerning the Samaritans, who rebelled and established for themselves [89] a tyrant in the land of Palestine. The ninth chapter of this discourse concerns how there appeared the heresy of Julian the Fantasiast, [who was] the bishop of the city of Halicarnassus.¹⁰ The tenth chapter presents the first letter of Julian to Severus, with an inquiry concerning the body of Christ our God. The eleventh chapter of this same narrative presents the reply to Julian's letter that the doctor Severus, the archbishop of the priests, wrote to him. The twelfth chapter of the book gives information concerning Julian's second letter that he wrote to Severus. The thirteenth chapter recalls the reply of Patriarch Severus to Julian's second letter. The fourteenth chapter of this book gives information concerning the riot that took place in the royal city in the tenth [indiction] year, and how Hypatius and Pompey were killed and [how] many people were massacred in the hippodrome. The fifteenth chapter gives information concerning the request contained in the petition that the believing bishops who were summoned from exile to the royal city presented to the Emperor Justinian concerning their faith. The sixteenth chapter of this ninth book presents the apology that the archbishop Severus made in his letter to Emperor Justinian, when he refused to arrive when he was summoned by him to the royal city. The seventeenth chapter of this ninth discourse recalls how Carthage, the chief city of the province of Africa, was captured

8 Tannûrîn, commonly referred to as Tannuris or Thannuris.

9 See n.31 below on the Qadishites.

10 The MS has 'Alexandria' but it is clear from the heading of ch.9 that 'Halicarnassus' is correct.

by the commander Belisarius with the Roman army and was subjugated to Emperor Justinian. [90] The eighteenth chapter of the ninth discourse gives information concerning Rome and Naples of the province of Italy, and how they were captured by the commander Belisarius and the Roman army. The nineteenth chapter of this ninth discourse describes how Patriarch Severus went up to the imperial city, appeared before the emperor, was received in the palace, remaining there until the end of the month of March in the fourteenth [indiction] year, and then departed. The twentieth chapter of the ninth book gives information concerning the letter of Patriarch Severus to the ranks of the bishops and the order of the monks in the East, concerning his expulsion from the royal city. The twenty-first [chapter] of the ninth discourse presents the canonical letter of accord and agreement by Anthimus, the head of the priests of the royal city, to Patriarch Severus. The twenty-second chapter of the ninth discourse presents the canonical letter of agreement and accord from Severus in reply to Anthimus, the archbishop in Constantinople, the imperial city. The twenty-third chapter of the ninth book recounts the canonical letter of agreement and union from Severus to Theodosius [the patriarch] of Alexandria. The twenty-fourth chapter of the ninth book presents the canonical letter of union and agreement [written] in reply from Patriarch Theodosius to the doctor Severus. The twenty-fifth chapter of the ninth discourse gives information concerning the canonical letter of agreement from Anthimus, the head of the priests of the royal city, to Theodosius, [91] the patriarch of the great city of Alexandria. The twenty-sixth chapter of the ninth book recounts the canonical reply of concord and brotherhood by Theodosius, the head of the bishops of Alexandria, to Anthimus, the head of the priests of the imperial city. Last in this ninth book,¹¹ mentioned above,¹² is the prologue in concise chapters of the one worthy of memory [among] the blessed ones, the holy Mara, the bishop of Amida, concerning the gospel and the [divine] economy of the Messiah in the flesh, and moreover a demonstration from the gospel of John, in the 89th canon, in which it speaks uniquely concerning the woman¹³ who was presented to him by the scholars of the Jews, [and] who [was] pregnant as a result of adultery.¹⁴

11 As Brooks, PZT ii, 62, n.2, notes, this last section seems to have been inserted here by mistake: the relevant passage is to be found at the end of PZ viii.

12 Following HB 221, emending *men* to *d'men*, an emendation not mentioned in PZT ii, 91.

13 John 7.53–8.11, cf. PZ viii.7b.

14 The prologue is to be found at PZ viii.7a, the pericope at viii.7b.

a. The first chapter of the ninth book, giving information concerning the beginning of the reign of Justinian, and concerning the battle that took place around Nisibis and the fortress of Tebetha.

In the fifth [indiction] year, during Justin's reign,¹⁵ this old man [Emperor Justin], who as we mentioned above was from the province of Illyricum, made his sister's son,¹⁶ who was a *magister militum*, Anticaesar.¹⁷ Justinian became Anticaesar on Thursday of the last week of the [Lenten] fast. When [Justinian] had been governing for three months, his uncle died at the end of July, [whereupon Justinian] became emperor in the 838th year of the Greeks, in the 327th Olympiad.¹⁸ For his own Castra Mauriana he ordered a great city to be built. Privileges were given to it and an army was stationed in it. Water was brought to it from afar, because the water [of the city] was of poor [quality].¹⁹ Thus, from the start of his reign [92] until today, as it were, he is engaged in building [in order] to renovate cities in every province, and to restore [defensive] walls in every locality for the protection of his dominions.²⁰

b. Since there was hostility between the Persians and the Romans, at the time when the *magister militum*²¹ Timostratus²² was *dux* on the frontier, there assembled [under] him an army with its officers [in order] to fight against Nisibis. Though they attacked, they did not capture it, and they moved on from there to the fortress of Tebetha. The army approached the

¹⁵ I.e. 526/7: see nn.2, 5 above.

¹⁶ On Justin's origins see PZ vii.14b.

¹⁷ See n.1 above on this term. Justinian had been *magister militum praesentalis* since 520: see Croke 2007, 33.

¹⁸ See nn.2, 5 above on this chronology; PZ again uses the Greek *autokratôr* here for emperor, cf. n.4 above.

¹⁹ See PZ vii n.225 on the waters at what PZ calls Castra Mauriana. He refers here clearly to Prima Iustiniana (in the province of Dacia Mediterranea, modern Caričin Grad), upon which Justinian undoubtedly did lavish his attention. See Snively 1999, Stein 1949, 396, Holum 2005, 90, Bavant 2007. It became the seat of the archbishop of Illyricum in 535. Of a garrison there is no trace, however, nor is one mentioned by Proc. *Aed.* iv.1.17–27. Water was brought into the city by an aqueduct from Petrova Gora, 17 km distant: see Proc. *Aed.* iv.1.19 with Snively 1999, 639, 652, Bavant 2007, 344.

²⁰ Justinian's building activity, glowingly described in Proc.'s *Aed.*, is also well attested archaeologically. For an overview see Moorhead 1994, 52–60, Evans 2005, 49–60.

²¹ Syr. *šrṯllys* < Gk. *stratêlatês*, normally *magister militum*, cf. next note.

²² Reading with PZT ii, 92 and HB 222, for 'Timos'. PZ's designation of Timostratus as *stratêlatês* implies a position as *magister militum*, although he is otherwise only attested as a *dux* (the title PZ here also accords him). For further discussion see Shahîd 1995, 174–5, *PLRE* ii, Timostratus and Greatrex 1998, 149 n.30.

wall and breached it, and this was during the hot period of the summer, but for some reason they were dislodged and did not take the fortress,²³ which was a journey of some fifteen parasangs from Dara.²⁴ The army was ordered to return to Dara, but because they [the soldiers] became ravenous for the food, [which was] a large [quantity] of preserved pork, they died of thirst on the road, and [others] were lost to the army [who] flung themselves into wells in the wilderness and were drowned, and the rest perished on the road; but the cavalry reached Dara, and then the army was disbanded.²⁵

a. The second chapter of the ninth book, concerning the battle that took place in the wilderness of Tannuris.²⁶

While Emperor Justin²⁷ was alive, [when] he learned that it was advantageous to build Tannuris into a city [as] a place of refuge in the desert and to station an army there for the protection of the 'Arab from the raiders of the Tayyayê,²⁸ the *silentarius* Thomas, who was a native of Aphphadana, was

23 Tebetha lies 50 km south of Nisibis. PZ's account here is somewhat opaque. Contrary to what I wrote in *Greatrex* 1998, 149 n.30, PZ clearly indicates that Timostratus was part of this failed operation. It is nevertheless likely that this attack is to be identified with that led by Libelarius in 527, described by *Proc. Wars* i.12.23, which failed to capture Nisibis. Given the distance from Nisibis to Tebetha, in the opposite direction to Dara, we might suppose that one force laid siege to the former, while the other headed south to Tebetha. Cf. *Greatrex* 1998, 148–9 and see map 4 below.

24 PZ's use of the parasang as a unit of measurement is unusual, although Boerm 2007, 201, points out that the *Tabula Peutingeriana* appears to use the unit for distances in the Sasanian empire generally. It was used in the Achaemenid empire and is the equivalent of 30 stades or 4 (Roman) miles or either 6296.64m or 5920m, depending on the length of the Roman mile in late antiquity; hence 15 parasangs should be about 90 km. See Schilbach 1970, 41–2, noting instances of Th. Sim.'s use of this unit. In fact the distance between Tebetha and Dara is about 65 km, cf. Dillemann 1962, 72–3 and fig.9.

25 The sufferings of the army are not surprising, given the heat of the summer in the region; the army of Julian had suffered similarly in its retreat from Lower Mesopotamia in June–August 363, on which see Ammianus xxv.1–2, 6 with Matthews 1989, 180–6 and den Boeft et al. 2005, 7. Kaegi 1991 considers the heat of (Lower) Mesopotamia in the summer; cf. Dillemann 1962, 54, emphasising the relative fertility of the region around Nisibis and 62–3, on wells in this area. The deleterious effects of an excess of meat on soldiers are noted by Ammianus at 22.12.6. Cf. also Th. Sim. i.13.9–12 for a similarly disastrous retreat in this area in 584.

26 Tannuris lies southwest of Tebetha: see map 4 below; it is well placed for intercepting incursions into the 'Arab (see PZ vii n.22 on this term) and Osrhoene. Altheim 1960, 20–2, offers a translation and commentary of this first section.

27 Reading with PZT ii, 92 and HB 222 for 'Justinian', a common confusion in Syriac sources.

28 Syr. *gaysê de tayyayê*.

sent to build it.²⁹ When he had prepared a certain amount of the [building] material,³⁰ the works that had begun were destroyed by the Ṭayyayê and the Qadishites who were in Singara and Tebetha.³¹ Since the Romans, as we made known above,³² had planned [93] to attack Nisibis and Tebetha, henceforth the Persians were also prepared, and made a defensive trench in the wilderness of Tannuris. The *dux, magister militum* Timostratus,³³ died, and Belisarius succeeded him.³⁴ He was not greedy for bribes, and was a friend to the peasants and did not permit the army to molest them.³⁵ Accompanying him was Solomon, a eunuch from the fortress of Idriphthon. He was an astute man, capable in the affairs of the world, having been a *notarius* to *dux* Felicissimus and having been attached to the rest of the governors, and he had become cunning through training by [tackling] problems.³⁶

29 Cf. *PLRE* ii, Thomas 11, although it is wrongly stated that he was sent to build a city at Apadna. The Aphphadana here referred to might well be the place 35 km north-east of Circesium along the Khabur, for which see Dillemann 1962, 203, but could equally be the Apadna west of Dara, the site of a battle in 503 reported by PZ vii.5a, see Greatrex 1998, 100 with map at 95.

30 This attempt to fortify Tannuris probably took place concurrently with the attacks on Nisibis and Tebetha, i.e. June–July 527: see Greatrex 1998, 150 and n.33. Although on this occasion the Romans were unable to erect a fortress, Justinian clearly later succeeded in doing so: see Proc. *Aed.* ii.6.14–16 and Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 86–7.

31 The Qadishites (also referred to as the Qadishayê) were a highland people who lived in the vicinity of the Jebel Sinjar; they are also attested in Ps.-Josh. 22 and elsewhere. See Nöldeke 1879, Luther 1997, 145, Trombley and Watt 2000, 19 n.96.

32 PZ ix.1b.

33 On the double titlature of Timostratus see n.22 above.

34 Belisarius became *dux* of Mesopotamia in late summer 527, following the disastrous attack on Tebetha: see *PLRE* iii, 182–3. PZ implies that he succeeded Timostratus in this position, while Proc. *Wars* i.12.24 explicitly makes him the successor of Libelarius (on whom see PZ viii n.56). Most probably Timostratus died not long after or even during the attack and Libelarius took temporary control of both Osrhoene and Mesopotamia. Thus both PZ and Proc. could be correct in making Belisarius the successor of Liberarius/Libelarius. Given that Proc. was Belisarius' secretary, an error on his part is unlikely, while PZ appears also to be very well informed of the changes of command. See also Greatrex 1998, 148–9 and n.30 (with the correction noted above, n.23). At the same time Hypatius took over as *magister militum per Orientem*: see Stein 1949, 272 n.2, *PLRE* ii, Hypatius 6.

35 This praise for Belisarius is noteworthy and echoes the positive assessment of Procopius (e.g. *Wars* iii.6.1–8 on the conduct of the Roman army in North Africa). For PZ's description cf. vii.6b (on Felicissimus), viii.4d (on Ephraem).

36 Lit. 'instruction of trials'; it is impossible to capture the shades of connotation of the text in the translation. On Solomon, who later became the chief commander in the reconquered provinces of North Africa, see *PLRE* iii, Solomon 1, where PZ's '*drbt* 'Edribath' is identified with Idriphthon at Proc. *Aed.* ii.4.14, cf. Th. Sim. ii.3.13 (who states that Solomon came from

b. So an army of soldiers was assembled to go into the wilderness of Tannuris against the Persians with Belisarius, Coutzes the brother of Boutzes, Basil, Vincentius and other leaders of the army, along with Al-Tafar the commander of the Ṭayyayê.³⁷ When the Persians heard [of the army's plans], they dug several pits among their defensive trenches by way of a stratagem, and on the outside they drove in³⁸ wooden tripod-like³⁹ stakes, and they left an interval (between them).⁴⁰ When the Roman army arrived, they were not aware ahead of time of the deceptive stratagem of the Persians.⁴¹ The heads of the army, in the rush of their impetuosity, entered the defensive trench of the Persians; when they fell into the pits they were captured and Coutzes was killed. Belisarius and the cavalry of the Roman army turned back, and, fleeing, they returned to Dara, but [those of] the infantry who did not escape were killed or taken captive.⁴² Al-Tafar, the king of the Ṭayyayê, as he was

near Solachon). See also Honigmann 1935, 13, Dillemann 1962, 238–9 and 55 fig.6 (placing Idriphthon 15 km east of Solachon). For Felicissimus, see *PLRE* ii, Felicissimus 2, otherwise only attested at PZ vii.6b as *dux* in 505/6.

37 This campaign, designed to restore Roman predominance in the vicinity of Tannuris, took place in 528. On the Roman commanders named see *PLRE* iii, Cuzes, Basilius 2, Vincentius; the battle is discussed under Belisarius, p.183. Al-Tafar is identified by Shahîd 1995, 63–7, with Jabala, the father of Harith the Jafnid, although Whittow 1999, 214–15, is more sceptical; cf. *PLRE* iii, Tapharas.

38 The verb *'škw* is not attested elsewhere in Syriac; its meaning is thus uncertain.

39 *trgwn'*, Gk. *trigônos*.

40 This passage is hard to interpret. We suggest that PZ envisages a series of pits dug along the perimeter of the Persian position (in addition to the visible trench). Stakes were also planted as a defensive measure elsewhere. The Romans saw the trench and the stakes, one presumes, and, in order to avoid them, took the route that led them into the pits prepared for them. For a discussion of the well-attested Persian use of trenches see Rance 2010 on Maur. *Strat.*, xi.1, n.9, who also considers this passage of PZ; see also Maur. *Strat.* iv.3 for a discussion of Roman methods of using trenches and laying traps for the enemy (with Rance 2010, book iv, n.8 (on trenches), nn.13, 16 (on caltrops, suggesting that this is what PZ is here alluding to). See further Rance 2007, 732, on Persian use of caltrops.

41 The Persian ruse of constructing trenches to damage the Roman cavalry was employed with success by Belisarius at Dara in 530; see Greatrex 1998, 156, 171. See further on ix.5 below.

42 The location of the clash between the two armies is unclear, since both Proc. *Wars* i.13.1–8 and Mal. 18.26 describe the same campaign but with variations: the former places it in the context of an attempt by Belisarius to construct a fort at Minduos, between Dara and Nisibis; the latter merely situates the battle in Mesopotamia. For a detailed analysis of this vexed question see Greatrex 1998, 156–9. PZ's account must be taken seriously and is probably to be preferred to the other two, at any rate for the placing of the battle. See also Syv  ne 2004, 460–1.

fleeing, was knocked down [from his mount] at close range and died.⁴³ He was an experienced man of war, was well trained in the technology of the Roman [military], and was famous everywhere [for] having won [several] battles.

a. [94] The third chapter of the ninth discourse, concerning the battle at Dara.⁴⁴

The Persians became haughty, acting boastfully and inflated with pride, as it were, and the *mihran*⁴⁵ and the *marzbans* assembled an army and came against Dara, setting up camp at 'Amodin, while being overwhelmingly confident, as they expected to overpower the city since the Roman forces [stationed] there had been reduced by their slaughter. Their cavalry and infantry prepared and they came from the south of the city in order to surround it completely and besiege it.⁴⁶ But a Roman force came upon them by the help of our Lord who chastens but does not deliver entirely over to death.⁴⁷ For a certain Sunica, who was a head of the army and a Hun who, having taken refuge with the Romans, was baptised [along with] Simas who was a Roman *chiliarch* and their armour-bearers, with twenty men each repulsed the entire Persian army from the city several times, passing through the army courageously from one side to the other, and slaughtering right and left. They were very experienced with the lance and the sword, their [battle] cry was powerful and fearsome, and they showed up the Persians to be timid, so that they fell down before them.⁴⁸ Two of the [Persian] leaders were

43 Cf. Mal. 18.26 for his fall from his horse, with Shahîd 1995, 174–5.

44 A much longer and more rhetorical account of this battle, the first of Belisarius' great victories, may be found in Proc. *Wars* i.13.9–14.55. He likewise emphasises (i.13.17) the Persian overconfidence before the battle, unsurprising given their series of recent victories. Only PZ, however, endows the Roman success with a Christian dimension. For a full discussion of the battle see Greatrex 1998, 168–85, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 88–91, Haldon 2001, 30–5, Syv  ne 2004, 461–2, Lillington-Martin 2007 (with useful plans and satellite images).

45 In fact, the name of a family, rather than a title, but because the family traditionally exercised military commands, western sources often supposed it to be a title. See Greatrex 1998, 176 and n.21.

46 Lillington-Martin 2007, 300–1, quotes this passage and illustrates with satellite images the probable route of advance of the Persian army. 'Amodin (Ammodius) lies 7.7 km south of Dara, cf. Greatrex 1998, 170 and n.9 and map 4 below. Proc. *Wars* i.14.12 also stresses the excessive pride of the Persians.

47 Psalm 117(118).18.

48 Following HB 224 n.4 reading Simas for MS *Simuth*. On Sunicas and Simas, see *PLRE* iii, Sunicas, Simmas, with Greatrex 1998, 174–5. Each may have commanded 300 men: see Greatrex 1998, 173 n.13. On the term *chiliarch*, which means (in Greek) 'commander of a

killed⁴⁹ along with a not inconsiderable force of cavalry. As for the *faige*, who are the Persian infantry,⁵⁰ the Heruls under Boutzes slaughtered many of them and scattered them to the east of the city.⁵¹ When the Persians saw that so many were killed, they managed to send [word] to Nisibis to bring as many beasts of burden as they could, and to come immediately to Dara, [in order] to take for themselves as much spoil as they could. When a large [number] had come, they loaded them with the bodies of the slain, and then went off in shame.⁵² [95] Nevertheless, the rest of the Persian army crossed into the Roman 'Arab and burned it with fire.⁵³

thousand', see Rance 2010 on Maur. *Strat.* i.4, esp. n.273: it is frequently used as an equivalent of the Latin military term 'tribune'. Mal. 18.60 (p.388.29) uses it in the context of this campaign for a Persian leader; see also Maurice, *Strategikon* i.4.13, for its use in the late sixth century as an equivalent of *moirarch* or *dux*. The Hunnic forces concerned were probably horse-archers, although PZ refers rather to their swords and lances. Some were Heruls, often referred to as Huns, as PZ calls them, who regularly served alongside regular Roman forces in Justinian's wars, while others, described by Proc. (*Wars* i.13.20–1) as Massagetae, will have been from other Hunnic tribes. See Greatrex 1998, 173–5, on these allies, esp. 174 n.16 on the Heruls.

PZ's account of the battle is very impressionistic, merely highlighting the valour of the two commanders and their immediate entourage. In fact, Belisarius' clever positioning of the Hunnic cavalry allowed the Persian advance on both flanks to be repelled successfully. Proc. makes clear that Sunicas deftly shifted his forces from the Roman left flank to the right in order to beat back the Persian offensive on this side (*Wars* i.14.44–50, cf. Greatrex 1998, 181–2), which probably explains PZ's reference to moves across the field of battle. Despite PZ's reference to trenches at ix.2, he here fails to mention those employed to good effect by Belisarius at this battle. With the fierce battle cry of the Heruls, cf. Men. Prot. 12.3 (on the Avars) and Ammianus 31.2.8 (on the Huns) and Cowan 2007 generally.

49 Probably the commander called Baresmanes by Proc. (see Greatrex 1998, 176 n.22 on the name) and his standard-bearer Sagus, on whose deaths see Proc. *Wars* i.14.46–53 with Greatrex 1998, 184 n.35.

50 The Persian infantry, the *paygân*, was comprised of levies from the peasantry and was of little military worth. See Greatrex 1998, 55, Christensen 1944, 289, 367–8, Shahbazi 1987, 497, Farrokh 2005, 23–5.

51 Boutzes commanded the Roman left wing, which bore the brunt of the initial Persian attack. When his forces retreated under pressure, Herul troops under the command of Pharas emerged from behind a hill and attacked the exposed Persian rear. See Proc. *Wars* i.14.33, Greatrex 1998, 181.

52 The Persian ruse implies a lack of confidence in the support to be had from the people of Nisibis, perhaps not unjustified. See PZ vii.5a, Evagr. v.9 with Lee 1993, 575 on support for Rome among Nisibenes in the sixth century. They also tended always to try to recover bodies from a battlefield in order to conceal the number of casualties, cf. Rance 2010, 207 n.6 on Maurice, *Strat.* xi.1. The fact that they were able to do so unhindered in this case may indicate that Belisarius' victory was far from complete.

53 Nothing further is known of this invasion of the 'Arab, but there is nothing inherently implausible in PZ's report; see Greatrex 1998, 185.

a. The fourth chapter is concerning the battle that took place on the Euphrates in [indiction year] nine.⁵⁴

The Persians, who through experiences learned⁵⁵ that they would suffer greatly from the onslaught of the Romans whenever they approached a city [because the Romans] went out against them, went up to Roman territory that was deserted and, encamping by the Euphrates, they constructed a trench as [was] their custom.⁵⁶ Belisarius at the head of the Roman army and the *chiliarchs*⁵⁷ prepared for battle against [the Persians]. The [two armies] met in the last week of the fast [of Lent] and the Persians appeared in their eyes to be like a small flock.⁵⁸ Asthebid their leader and those who were with him were struck with fear of them.⁵⁹ He sent [word] to the Romans, asking them to respect the feast, 'for the sake of the Nazarenes and the Jews who are in the army that is with me, and for the sake of you who are Christians.'⁶⁰ When the *magister militum* Belisarius considered this

54 I.e. 530/1. PZ's account of the Callinicum campaign is brief but broadly accurate. The Persians had invaded Roman territory in March by proceeding up the Euphrates with a force of about 20,000 men. They penetrated as far as near Gabbula, in Syria I, but were then forced to withdraw by the appearance of Belisarius and the bulk of the Roman army of the East. See Greatrex 1998, 195–8, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 92–3.

55 Lit. 'became wise.'

56 Cf. Maurice, *Strat.*, xi.1, who describes how the Persians usually protected themselves with a trench, cf. *De sci. pol.dial.* iv.55–6 with Bell 2009, 137. Mal. 18.60 confirms PZ here: according to him, the army dug a ditch and then scattered caltrops around it when it was encamped near Gabbula. It had long been the standard procedure of the Roman army, of course, to construct ditches in the preparation of a marching camp: see (e.g.) Keppie 1984, 36–8, Goldsworthy 1996, 111–13, Goldsworthy 2003, 171–2; this then seems to have influenced the Persians, see Rance 2010, 208 n.9. PZ notes the use of trenches by the Persians in 528 (ix.2, see n.40 above), which seemed to take the Romans by surprise, however.

57 See n.48 above on this term.

58 The Roman army shadowed the Persians as they withdrew from Roman territory. The Persians arrived opposite Callinicum, on the south side of the Euphrates, on Good Friday, 18 April 531. On the next day, Belisarius' forces, setting out from Sura, caught up with them. See Greatrex 1998, 200–1.

59 *Proc. Wars* i.17.1 gives the commander's name rather as Azarethes. 'Asthebid' is probably a rendering of the Persian title, *spahbadh*, cf. Greatrex 1998, 104 n.86 (and see PZ viii n.68).

60 See Shahîd 1995, 722–6, on Christians among the forces of al-Mundhir (with PZ viii n.42). It is quite possible that some of his men were also Jewish, given the religion's strength in the Arabian peninsula at the time; see also Parkes 1934, 260 (assuming Persian Jews are involved). The use of two distinct terms for Christians is interesting, i.e. Nazarenes and Christians: this is probably a reflection of historic divisions within the Persian church, which led to different groups of Christians being referred to by different names. See Brock 1971, 92–4. S. Stern advises us that in 531 some Jews at least are likely to have observed Passover around the same time as Easter, although practices will have varied between communities.

[proposal], he was favourable to it, but the heads of the armies complained a great [deal], and did not accept to wait and honour the holiday.⁶¹ Although by dawn they had prepared for battle on the first day of unleavened bread, the day [brought forth] a cold wind that was against the Romans, and they showed themselves to be weak and fled.⁶² As they retreated from the Persian offensive they fell into the Euphrates; many drowned and others were killed.⁶³ Belisarius escaped, but the son of the sister of Boutzes was captured:⁶⁴ [Boutzes] was sick in Amida and had not gone to the battle, but sent his army with Domitziolus to Abgarshat.⁶⁵ He [Domitziolus] went down to Persian territory but later returned; how that happened I shall now recount in the following chapter.

a. The fifth chapter of the ninth book, concerning how Gadar the Qadishite, a Persian general, was killed, [96] and how Izdegerd, who was

61 Lit. 'day.' Proc. *Wars* i.18.16 confirms Belisarius' willingness to allow the enemy to depart: his objective had been fulfilled without a battle, since the invasion had been repelled. The desire of the Roman commanders to avenge the Persian attack is comprehensible, particularly in light of Mundhir's spectacular raid of 529 (see PZ viii.5a). Cf. Greatrex 1998, 198–200.

62 PZ rightly stresses the disadvantages to which the Romans were subject: they had marched from Sura to Callinicum on an empty stomach that day (see Greatrex 1998, 200). PZ's chronological reference is somewhat unclear, but probably refers to the Saturday before Easter, although normally the first day of unleavened bread in this year would be the Friday. While Proc. *Wars* i.18.32–4 implies that the Romans enjoyed an advantage in the exchange of missiles, PZ's reference to a hostile wind is more plausible. See Greatrex 1998, 202. On the feast of unleavened bread, i.e. Passover/Easter and the subsequent week, cf. PZ xii.5b.

63 The Persians broke through the Roman flank furthest from the Euphrates, forcing Belisarius to reposition his forces with the river behind them and to stand firm until the end of the day. Mal. 18.60 offers a rather distorted version of the course of the battle, pinning the blame on Belisarius and highlighting the role of Sunicas and Simmas, and playing down the Roman defeat. Some Roman forces undoubtedly did drown in the Euphrates as they sought to retreat, as PZ reports; Proc. *Wars* i.18.49 refers to an island, on which some soldiers sought refuge. For a full discussion see Greatrex 1998, 202–7, Syvärne 2004, 462–4. Shahid 1995, 134–42, offers a rather different assessment of the battle, more critical of the pro-Belisarius version propounded by Proc.

64 Mal. 18.60 claims that Belisarius was among the first to flee; Proc. *Wars* i.18.41 indicates the contrary, which is more plausible, cf. Greatrex 1998, 206 and n.34. Boutzes' nephew is the Domitziolus referred to almost immediately below, referred to in other sources as Domnentiolus (with further variations).

65 The reference to Amida is interesting, perhaps pointing to use of Amidene sources. Mal. 18.61 describes a Persian assault on Abgersaton (precise location uncertain) in Osrhoene, with which this reference to Domitziolus and his army should be connected. Despite initial Roman successes, the fort was captured by the Persians and the garrison taken into captivity. Among those taken prisoner was Boutzes' nephew: see *PLRE* iii, Domnentiolus, Greatrex 1998, 207.

with him and who was the son of the sister of Hormizd the *ptehasha* of Arzanene was taken captive.

In the days of the *dux* Belisarius in the fifth [indiction] year,⁶⁶ the Romans, who had been thwarted in building Tannuris on the frontier, wanted to build a city at Melabasa.⁶⁷ Therefore⁶⁸ Gadar the Qadishite⁶⁹ was sent with an army by Kavadh, and he stopped the Romans and sent them fleeing in the battle that he fought with them on the hill of Melabasa. He had access to Kavadh, and he was assigned with an army to guard the frontier from the east to Melabasa in the region of Arzanene as far as Maipherqaṭ. This man boasted a great deal against the Romans and spoke idly, blaspheming like Rabshakeh, who was sent by Sennacherib.⁷⁰ He led with him some seven hundred equipped cavalry and soldiers who went out to collect the spoil.⁷¹ They crossed the Tigris in the district of Attakhaya⁷² of the province of

66 Probably August 527: see Greatrex 1998, 150 n.35.

67 There is some disagreement as to the precise location of the Melabasa mountains; most probably they were situated on the north side of the Tur Abdin, downstream from Amida: see Greatrex 1998, 150. The Roman fort would therefore have threatened Arzanene from the southwest.

68 MS reads *bdwyn*, i.e. 'in Dvin' (or perhaps rather some unknown place). We accept however the emendation suggested by Nöldeke 1879, 159 n.1, reading *bdgwn*, i.e. 'therefore', cf. HB 226 n.5. Brooks subsequently rejected the emendation in PZT ii, 96.5. The reason why some have preferred to maintain *bdwyn* is to associate this campaign with the construction of Minduos (Proc. *Wars.* i.13.1–8), for which there are no grounds. For detail see Greatrex 1998, 150 n.35, cf. Dillemann 1962, 316–18.

69 On the Qadishites see n.31 above.

70 The Aramaic *rab shaqe* is treated in the Hebrew Bible (2 Kings 18.17) and in the Septuagint as a proper noun, cf. Isaiah 36.2. Sennacherib (Akkadian *Sîn-ahhā-eriba*) is the Neo-Assyrian ruler (701–681 B.C.) who besieged Jerusalem in 701 B.C. during the reign of Hezekiah, the king of Judah. For such boasting, and in particular the comparison with Rabshakeh, cf. Thdrt. *HE* v.37.8 in Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 41.

71 Mal.18.65 offers another account of this same campaign, noting that Hermogenes, the *magister officiorum*, submitted a report about it. As one might expect from such a report (cf. Greatrex 1998, 194–5), Roman successes seem to be exaggerated. According to Mal.'s version, 6000 Persians crossed the Nymphius to attack Martyropolis, and the Romans proved unable in a first engagement to overcome them; but in the second, by feigning flight, they disrupted the enemy and drove them back with the loss of 2000 Persians. While some of Mal.'s detail may well be correct, e.g. on the Roman tactics, PZ's more sober assessment of the numbers involved is more plausible. See Greatrex 1998, 209.

72 Bet Attakhaya (Greek/Latin: Attachae) lies 20 km from Martyropolis; PZ's figure of 4 stades (below) is evidently corrupt. HB 227 n.4 are incorrect in accepting Proc.'s figure (*Wars* i.21.9) of 100 stades from Attachae to Martyropolis, however: see Greatrex 1998, 209 n.43. The distance is closer to 30 km, cf. Honigmann 1935, map 1. See further Dillemann 1962, 235–6, Adontz 1970, 375 n.8a; PZ's reference to 'the province of Amida' must be a loose term, perhaps

Amida. Bessa was the commander of Maipherqat, and it was summer-time of [indiction year] nine.⁷³ With Gadar was Izdegerd, the son of the sister of the *ptehasha*, who knew the region of Attakhaya as though he were a local.⁷⁴ When Bessa heard, he went out against him with some five hundred cavalry from Maipherqat, which was about four stades⁷⁵ distant. He met him at Bet Helte and fought a battle on the Tigris, killing Gadar and capturing Izdegerd, and bringing him up to Maipherqat.⁷⁶ After the peace that was made in [indiction year] ten, [Izdegerd] was given in exchange for Domitziolus, who returned from Persia.⁷⁷ After slaughtering the Persian cavalry and Gadar, who were guarding the frontier of Arzanene, the *dux* Bessa entered the region and destroyed much of it, and, taking captives, brought them to Maipherqat.⁷⁸

a. The sixth chapter [97] in this ninth discourse narrates to us the attack that took place against Maipherqat, and the not inconsiderable army of the Huns that invaded Roman territory.

The villages that were in the region of Arzanene belonged to the Persian kingdom and a not inconsiderable [sum of] poll-taxes is collected from their residents for the royal treasury and for the office of the *ptehasha* who is

for the northern part of the province of Mesopotamia. See also map 3 below.

73 PZ dates the episode precisely to summer 531. Bessa was *dux*, but, *contra* PLRE ii, Bessas, he cannot have been the *dux* of Mesopotamia, since the seat of this ducate was in Dara. In fact by this stage *duces* were attached to cities, rather than provinces, just as PZ implies. See Greatrex 2007c, 95–6.

74 PZ is the only source to mention this Izdegerd, the nephew of the *bdeashkh* Hormizd (on whom see PZ ix.6a). The title *bdeashkh* (Syr. *ptehasha*) is the Armenian rendering of the Persian *petiaxes*, indicating a ruler of a border province; in Arsacid times, the *bdeashkh* of Arzanene was known as the keeper of the Arabian march and was the most important of the four regional commanders. See Greatrex 1998, 176, Garsoïan 1989, 516–17, Sundermann 1989, Hewsén 1988–9, 295–9. According to Hewsén, the office was abolished under Khusrō I.

75 See n.72 on this (incorrect) figure.

76 Setting out from Martyropolis, Bessa would have to cover a considerable distance travelling due south to reach the Tigris; the invaders were in any case coming from the east, from Arzanene. Consequently PZ's reference to the Tigris is probably an error for the Nymphius, as Honigsmann 1935, 17 (cf. map 1) argues. Bet Helte lies about 15 km southwest of Attachae. See Greatrex 1998, 209.

77 PZ had mentioned the capture of Domitziolus at ix.4a: see n.65 above. He is clearly well informed of campaigns in Sophanene, not far from Amida. He was returned to the Romans in 531/2, according to PZ, just before the Eternal Peace of 532 (indiction 11, cf. PZ ix.7b).

78 Arzanene was regularly the target of Roman reprisal raids, e.g. during the war of 502–5, on which see Greatrex 1998, 97 (again reported by PZ at vii.5a), cf. Whitby 1988, 269, on an invasion made by Maurice in 578 (with Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 161).

stationed there, he being the king's prefect.⁷⁹ As recounted above, the *dux* Bessa did much damage to this region,⁸⁰ even taking the son of the sister of the *ptehasha* captive and keeping him prisoner in Maipherqaṭ. King Kavadh became very embittered when he learned from the *ptehasha* about the devastation of the region, because this Hormizd had left no stone unturned, using the army and the palace of the king⁸¹ against Maipherqaṭ in order to conquer it, because it serves as a redoubt and place of refuge for the Roman army [from which] to inflict damage on Arzanene.⁸² Then, so to speak, a force was equipped by the Persian army, and Mihr Girovi was sent to hire a large [number] of Huns and bring [them] to their aid. They prepared [for battle] and mustered against Maipherqaṭ at the beginning of [indiction year] ten.⁸³ They made a trench against it and a mound, as well as many mines, and pressed upon it in battle and put pressure on it. In [the city] was a not inconsiderable Roman force as well as Boutzes, and they repelled a large number of Persians in battle,⁸⁴ but Nonnus too, the bishop of the city, died.⁸⁵

b. Belisarius, whom the emperor blamed because the Roman army was slaughtered by the Persians at Tannuris and on the Euphrates, was released [from command], and he went up to the emperor, and after him Constantine

79 PZ is the only source about the status of villages in Arzanene. His statement on their prosperity is corroborated by Joh. Eph. *HE* vi.15, who specifically notes the prosperity of the region, cf. Altheim 1960, 24. On the head-tax referred to, see Ps.-Josh. 11 with Altheim and Stiehl 1957, 35–49, Goodblatt 1979, Rubin 1995, 231–2. Altheim 1960, 22–3, offers a translation of this chapter, followed by a detailed commentary.

80 At PZ ix.5a.

81 The text here is corrupt; we read *malkêh* for *mallêh*. HB 228 suggested 'using force and cunning' while holding out the alternative idea of bribery based on the literal meaning of the passage, 'a palace which he filled.' PZ here seems to refer to the army and *palation* of the Persians, the latter referring most probably to the palace guards: so Altheim 1960, 24.

82 Martyropolis had been founded at the very start of the fifth century with relics of martyrs killed in persecutions in Persia: see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 31 with Key Fowden 1999, 40–56. Its site, and indeed its name, were provocative and facilitated raids such as Bessa's, cf. Whitby 1988, 212. The city's defences had probably been upgraded recently (despite Proc. *Wars* i.21.7–8): see Whitby 1984, Greatrex 1998, 210. The siege undertaken by the Persians in September 531 is described also by Proc. *Wars* i.21.4–8., Mal. 18.66, the latter with significant details, e.g. on the erection of a counter-siege tower within the city.

83 I.e. late 531. Mihr Girovi is not otherwise attested, unless he is to be identified with Proc.'s Mermeroes (*Wars* i.15.2), cf. Greatrex 1998, 186 n.41, for the possibility. Most of the Huns whom he was sent to recruit did not arrive until December 531: see below. Proc. *Wars* i.21.4 refers to the Persian commanders as Khanaranges, Aspebedes and Mermeroes, on whom see Greatrex 1998, 209 and n.44.

84 See n.82 above on details of the siege. Proc. *Wars* i.21.5 confirms that both Boutzes and Bessa were present at Martyropolis.

85 On Nonnus see PZ viii.5b; he must therefore have died in autumn 531.

[became commander] at Dara.⁸⁶ An army of many soldiers was assembled and Sittas was the *magister militum*, and Bar Gabala, the king of the Tayyayê, was with them. They arrived in Amida in October [or November] of [indiction year] ten.⁸⁷ The hermit John of Anastasia, [98] a man honoured for his way of life, who had been elected [to episcopal office], accompanied them.⁸⁸ When they had gone to Maipherqaṭ, winter arrived, and this being a cold, northern region, the Persians were hindered [from further attacks] by rain and mud. They suffered hardship and were afraid of the multitude of the Roman army.⁸⁹ While [the Persians] were there, their king Kavadh died, and they made a treaty with the Romans so that they could withdraw from the city.⁹⁰

c. Soon after they had departed and Maipherqaṭ was freed [from the siege], when the Roman army returned [to its bases], the Huns who were the mercenaries of the Persians appeared. This numerous⁹¹ people fell upon

86 On the dismissal of Belisarius following an enquiry about the defeat at Callinicum see Greatrex 1998, 194–5, 207. See also PZ ix.2, 4 for the events mentioned. See PLRE iii, Constantinus 3 for Constantine, who, if the identification is correct, tried to assassinate Belisarius seven years later.

87 Sittas was a *magister militum praesentalis*, cf. PLRE iii, Sittas. Bar Gabala, i.e. the son of Gabala, refers to Harith, the Jafnid leader of the Ghassanids: see Shahid 1995, 142 and n.415. PZ does not specify whether the month was first or second Teshrin, i.e. October or November (531). From Amida they proceeded to Attachae (Bet Attakhaya, on which see above n.72), threatening the besiegers of Martyropolis: see Proc. Wars i.21.9–10 with Greatrex 1998, 210–11. The *magister militum per Armeniam* Dorotheus meanwhile led an incursion into Persarmenia, on which see Greatrex 1998, 208–9.

88 PZ viii.5f relates that John of Anastasia was killed in the desert by the Hunnic invaders (in December 531), on whom see below. Altheim 1960, 26, argues that PZ refers here to Anastasia, the wife of Anastasius' nephew Pompey, for whom see PLRE ii, Anastasia 3; this is most unlikely. Brooks, PZV ii, 67 n.10, interprets PZ as referring here to an elevation to the rank of bishop, cf. AK 174.18. He is not included, however, in Honigsmann 1951. Other cases of bishops accompanying armies are attested: see Whitby 1988, 299–300, 1998, 197–8, cf. Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 229, 231 (from the *Khuzistan Chronicle*), on bishops attending Khusrō II (or failing to). It is obscure how John came to die at the hands of the Huns in the desert when at this stage he was in the company of an army.

89 PZ rightly highlights the two dangers menacing the Persians – the arrival of Sittas' force and the onset of winter – leaving them little option but to withdraw. See Greatrex 1998, 210–11. Cf. PZ vii.3c on Persian difficulties in coping with winter conditions.

90 Kavadh died on 13 September 531, see PLRE iii, Cavades. News will have reached the besiegers only in October. Proc. Wars i.21.11–16 reports that Roman scouts had successfully misled the Persians into believing that the approaching Huns had taken their side, which further encouraged the invaders to retreat. The Romans therefore offered two hostages, whereupon the Persians withdrew. See Greatrex 1998, 211.

91 Lit. 'large.'

Roman territory suddenly, and slaughtered and killed many of the peasants of the land. They set fire to the villages and their churches, and crossed the Euphrates, reaching as far as Antioch. None could stand against them [so as] to assail them except this Bessa, the commander of Maipherqat, who fell upon some of them as they were returning, and killed more than five hundred cavalry and [took] much spoil.⁹² The man became rich, and at the fortress of Qithariz (Citharizon) the commander there repelled some four hundred of their men and their cattle were left behind.⁹³

d. After Kavadh, his son Khusro reigned.⁹⁴ His mother, during the life of her husband Kavadh, was possessed by a demon, and all the magi, sorcerers, and enchanters who were called by her husband Kavadh, who very much loved her, did not profit her at all, but truth be told, they added demons upon demons to her.⁹⁵ She was sent in the fourth [indiction year] in the days of the *dux* Liberarius to the blessed Moses who had a monastery above Dara, some two parasangs [99] from the region.⁹⁶ He was famous, and she was with him a few days and was purified, and returned to her land, having taken from

92 This invasion of the Sabir Huns took the population of the East by surprise: the last such major incursion had taken place in 395, on which see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 17–19, Breccia 2004, 50–4. Mal. 18.70 confirms the wide reach of the invaders: he states that they penetrated as far as Euphratesia, Cilicia II and Cyrrhestike, i.e. not far from Antioch; it is briefly mentioned by Proc. *Wars* i.21.28. According to Mal., Justinian, having established that the Persians were not responsible for the incursion, ordered Dorotheus to drive back the invaders, which he did with some success. Only PZ highlights the successes enjoyed by Bessa. See Greatrex 1998, 212.

93 The text reads ‘increased.’ The identity of the *dux* at Citharizon is uncertain. On this important fortress, to the north of Martyropolis, see Howard-Johnston 1989.

94 On the accession of Khusro see Mal. 18.68, Proc. *Wars* i.21.17–22 with Stein 1949, 294 n.2, Christensen 1944, 361–2 and Greatrex 1998, 211. As he was not the eldest son of Kavadh, his succession was not straightforward, and initially Justinian attempted to destabilise his position by refusing to negotiate with him. Boerm 2007, 111–19, discusses Sasanian successions in detail, concentrating on this episode.

95 Christian literature abounds with tales of Persian kings cured by saints, e.g. Yazdgerd I being cured of a headache by the ambassador and doctor Marutha, Socr. *HE* vii.8.6, cf. Schilling 2008, 141–2. Christian doctors were highly regarded at the Sasanian court: see Proc. *Wars* ii.28.8–11 on the doctor Tribunus, who tended Khusro, with *PLRE* iii, Tribunus 2, PZ xii.7p and cf. Le Coz 1993, 103–5. Theoph. 142 refers to a Christian bishop, Boazanes, revered for his medical skill by Kavadh: see Schilling 2008, 142, 97. Nothing further is known about Khusro’s mother, however; the Armenian version of Mich. Syr. actually claims she was baptised, cf. Schilling 2008, 141–2.

96 The date is 525/6. This Moses is otherwise unattested. On the parasang see n.24 above; the distance must be about 12 km. It is not a coincidence that both PZ’s references to the parasang involve distances from Dara. Given the proximity of Dara to the frontier, Moses’ monastery at ʿTarmel could have been in Persian territory; Dillemann 1962, 32, merely places it in the vicinity of Dara, cf. Fiey 1970, 95. On Liberarius see PZ viii.4a.

this holy Moses of the monastery called Tarmel the blessing of the bones of Cyriacus the martyr⁹⁷ so that she could take refuge in it for her protection, so that the [evil] spirit would not return upon her; and she built for him in a secret [place]⁹⁸ a house of prayer in her land in order to honour [him], and he was venerated there. When she remembered the grace that had happened to her through this blessed Moses of Tarmel, she aided the country of the Romans with a purpose and reason that are described below.

a. The seventh chapter of the ninth discourse, [describing] how there was peace between the Persians and the country of the Romans, which lasted six or seven years in the days of Rufinus and Hermogenes the *magister [officiorum]*.

When Emperor Justinian was contemplating the [events] that had happened in his dominion in Upper Mesopotamia, the army that from time to time was defeated by the Persians, the peasants of the land who were killed and taken captive by the Huns, and the land that was burned [along] with its villages,⁹⁹ he declined to send the army again to fight in battle with Khusro, who reigned after his father Kavadh. Since [Khusro] was the friend of Rufinus, who had counselled his father that he should become ruler after him, [Rufinus] used to talk to King [Khusro] and encourage him, promising that when[ever] he might appear in [Khusro's] country, anything that [Khusro] justly asked of him he would accept for the sake of the peace that was so desired by King [Khusro].¹⁰⁰

97 Numerous martyrs were called Cyriacus. The most likely Cyriacus in this case is a Jewish convert, who took the name of Cyriacus and was martyred during the reign of Julian, according to a highly doubtful tradition. See Guidi 1904 for a life of this Cyriacus with Drijvers and Drijvers 1997, 27–9, Fiey 2004, no.108; as van Esbroeck 1990 notes, the patriarch Severus expressed grave reservations about the authenticity of this martyr around this time. AK 368 proposed an identification with an even less historical Cyriacus who baptised Diocletian's daughter Artemia and the daughter of Shapur I, Jobias. See *De SS Cyriaco, Largo, Smaragdo et sociis martyribus*, esp.339–42; also *BHO*, nos.233–6.

98 Syr. *berâzâ meddem*, 'by some secret.' HB 230 n.1 took this to mean that she constructed a shrine in which to venerate Cyriacus under the form of Zoroastrian rites, which is hardly plausible in the context. See also Schilling 2008, 141–2, on church-building in the wake of such miracles.

99 PZ's positive portrayal of Justinian's solicitude for the eastern provinces is noteworthy, given the anti-Chalcedonian policies pursued by the emperor. The damage inflicted by the continuation of hostilities, material as well as psychological, should not be underestimated: see Trombley 1997, although he concentrates on Syria.

100 On Rufinus see *PLRE* ii, Rufinus 13 with Greatrex 1998, 213–14 correcting *PLRE*'s chronology. No other source reports his influence on Kavadh, but Proc. *Wars* i.11.24 implies that he enjoyed close links with the ruling dynasty, cf. Boerm 2007, 319.

b. So this Rufinus and Hermogenes the *magister [officiorum]* were sent in [indiction year] eleven [100] [as] ambassadors to Khusro, and they spoke [about] many [matters] with him. This Rufinus was known there as one who was sent several times to Kavadh and was his friend and honoured the nobles of his kingdom with many gifts. The queen, the mother of Khusro, loved him because he [had] advised Kavadh concerning her son that he should become king, and she had a debt of gratitude to the blessed Moses of the monastery of Tarmel on account of God who [had] healed her.¹⁰¹ She earnestly entreated Khusro her son, and in consideration of [the sum of] gold that he had accepted, which had been sent from the Emperor Justinian, and in accordance with the [message] that was sent to him from Rufinus and Hermogenes his ambassadors, he made peace.¹⁰² Documents were signed, and the stars were seen jumping in the heavens in a new [way].¹⁰³ It was the summer of [indiction year] eleven, and [the peace] held for six or seven years, until [indiction] year three.¹⁰⁴

a. The eighth chapter of the ninth book is about the Samaritans who rebelled and established for themselves a tyrant in the province of Palestine.¹⁰⁵

101 Lit. 'the god of her healing.'

102 After the Hunnic raid, negotiations resumed in February/March 532, but faltered in April/May, when Rufinus, upon returning from Constantinople to confer with the emperor, announced that Justinian was not prepared to cede forts in Lazica to the Persians, as the Roman delegation had earlier accepted. See Proc. *Wars* i.22.9–15 with Greatrex 1998, 214. Because the Romans had already handed over a portion of the gold that they had agreed to pay to Khusro, it was left to Rufinus, the leading advocate of a peaceful settlement, to retrieve the funds; only with difficulty was he able to do so. His fellow ambassadors, Hermogenes, Alexander (*PLRE* iii, Alexander 1) and Thomas (*PLRE* iii, Thomas 4) therefore viewed him with suspicion. Cf. Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 96–7, Boerm 2007, 319.

103 On the shower of stars that followed the conclusion of peace see also PD ii, 53/49 (dated to AG 843, i.e. 531/2), Mal. 18.75 with Greatrex 1998, 218, Meier 2003a, 661 (with further references).

104 Despite the break in negotiations in April/May, by September Hermogenes and Rufinus were in a position to visit the Persian court and conclude a definitive settlement. For this date, which fits with PZ's dating, summer of year 11 (= 532/3), i.e. September 532, see Greatrex 1998, 214 n.5. On the terms of the 'Eternal Peace' see Greatrex 1998, 215–18. No other source refers to the role of Khusro's mother in the negotiations; Khusro had good reasons to want an end to hostilities in any case, not the least of which was the need to consolidate his position. See Greatrex 1998, 211, Bosworth 1999, 138 n.356, Crone 1991, 31–3, cf. Proc. *Wars* i.23.1–29. PZ rightly places the termination of the peace in indiction year 3, i.e. 539/40.

105 The Samaritan revolt described here by PZ, provoked at least to some extent by intolerant legislation of Justinian, is discussed in detail by Pummer 2002, 235 (on PZ), 306–7 (on Cyr. Scyth. *Vit. Sab.* 71–3), 259–61 (on Mal. 18.35 and *De insid.* 44), Winkler 1965,

When the Samaritans of the province of Palestine who were near the city of Neapolis and not far from Caesarea learned that the Persians from time to time attacked and invaded Roman territory, and imagining that [the Romans] had shown themselves to be weak [in the face of the Persians],¹⁰⁶ they were emboldened, thinking that they had been deported from Kuth, Babylon, 'Awa, Hamath, and Sefarwayim by Shalmaneser [the Fifth] the king of Assyria, and had been settled in the land of Samaria.¹⁰⁷ They made [101] a tyrant as a leader for themselves when they rebelled, and they entered Neapolis¹⁰⁸ and killed Mamona,¹⁰⁹ who was the bishop there. They took up arms and were inflicting harm, causing a disturbance in the province, wanting to help the Persians, because they had been settled from their country in Roman territory.¹¹⁰ They burned many sanctuaries of saints, and seized the city and collected the spoil. When the emperor heard about this, he sent the *chiliarch* Hadrian;¹¹¹ both the *dux* of the province and with

Rabello 1988, 409–22, Shahid 1995, 82–95, Meier 2003a, 194, 209–15. Cf. Noethlichs 2007 more generally. As Pummer notes, PZ's placing of the episode is misleading, since the revolt actually broke out in early 529 and was crushed in the following year.

106 PZ refers to no specific engagement; as noted above (on ix.1–2) the Romans had suffered several setbacks in 527–8. Mundhir's raid of March 529 (PZ viii.5a) may have further emboldened the rebels, cf. Pummer 2002, 261.

107 2 Kings 17.24–41 recounts how people from the places here mentioned were settled in Samaria to take the place of the deported Israelites; they failed, however, to abide strictly by the practices of the Israelites and thus distinguished themselves from them. PZ i.3 (PZT i, 12–13/8) claims that a Syrian codex of Genesis (according to Epiphanius of Cyprus) was copied by an exiled (Jewish) priest and then sent to the Samaritans installed in the place of the Israelites; exactly the same cities of origin are there named. See Pummer 2002, 237, for the passage. On Shalmaneser V (726–722 B.C.) and these events see Mitchell 1988, 338–44, Kuhrt 1995, 418. Joh. Nik. 90.4 states that the revolt's leader, Julian, claimed divine backing for his attempt to restore the Samaritan kingdom: see Meier 2003a, 212–14 on the messianic aspects of the uprising.

108 The revolt began in Scythopolis in April/May 529, but quickly spread to Neapolis: see Pummer 2002, 260. The tyrant was called Julian, son of Sabaron, on whom see *PLRE* iii, Iulianus 3. According to Mal. (18.35) and other sources, he held chariot-races in Neapolis and was responsible for instigating the death of many Christians; he also had himself crowned king. See Pummer 2002, 261, Meier 2003a, 212.

109 This is Cyr. Scyth.'s Mamona (*Vit. Sab.* 172.9), cf. Pummer 2002, 235.

110 Mal. 18.54 gives some credence to the Persian dimension of the revolt, in that he reports the interception by Belisarius in 530 of Samaritan leaders on their way to Persian territory, although by this point the revolt had been crushed. See further Greatrex 1998, 191–2.

111 The *chiliarch* Hadrian is not mentioned in other accounts, cf. *PLRE* iii, Hadrianus 1; on the term *chiliarch* see n.48 above. The leading role in putting down the revolt is generally attributed to the *dux* Theodore (Simus), although there is still some discussion as to who was in command at what point. For details see Pummer 2002, 235, 259–61, *PLRE* iii, Theodorus 5.

him the army of the Romans and Tayyayê¹¹² who were in the ‘Arab were assembled, and they engaged the Samaritans, who were slaughtered by the soldiers. The soldiers killed the tyrant, captured the city, and returned it to their control, as by the former arrangement. They also appointed a bishop and an army for his protection and for the [good] order of the [inhabitants] of the province.¹¹³

a. The ninth chapter of the ninth discourse is about the heresy of the Fantasiast, who is Julian of Halicarnassus, and how it appeared.

Julian was the bishop of the city of Halicarnassus, who along with the rest of the faithful bishops left his see out of zeal.¹¹⁴ He was an old man who was zealous in faith, who when he was asked to say ‘two natures,’ in the same manner as Eutyches and those monks who did not properly discern the order [of the problem], fell into the heresy of Eutyches.¹¹⁵ He was an acquaintance and friend of Severus, the eloquent head of the priests. Once, when this Julian was asked by someone *what the confession of the holy*

112 On the Arab involvement in the suppression of the revolt see Shahîd 1995, 82–95, Pummer 2002, 264–5: the Jafnids played a significant part in defeating the rebels. Following the massacre of many Samaritans, others were taken prisoner and then sold into slavery: see Rabello 1988, 420, Pummer 2002, 261, 265.

113 No further details on this bishop are known, although he is likely to be the John attested in September 536 (*ACO* iii, p.189), cf. *HEO*, 1028. Winkler 1965, 445–7, discusses Justinian’s measures to pacify the region, reacting in part to an embassy of the aged saint Sabas.

114 Under Anastasius, Julian had collaborated with Severus in ousting Macedonius from the patriarchate of Constantinople (on which see PZ vii.7–8 above). They were both obliged to flee their sees in 518 and found refuge in Egypt. See Draguet 1924, 4, 10–11, Allen and Hayward 2004, 28. The doctrines advocated by Julian after his arrival there broke with the mainstream of anti-Chalcedonianism in that Julian placed great emphasis on the divine aspect of Christ. According to one (more generous) interpretation of his views, which are hard to reconstruct because of the fragmentary state of his writings, Christ was not subject to original sin and therefore, although he suffered physically, it was not as a result of original sin, as it is for the rest of mankind: see Draguet 1924, 257–60, Draguet 1937, 92–3. On another interpretation, Julian went further and argued that Christ was not really human in nature and thus that his body was incorruptible (on which the hostile labels of ‘aphthartodocetist’ and ‘fantasiast’ were based), but he was able to choose to suffer. See Maspero 1923, 88–95, Jugie 1925, 134–6, 263–4 with Draguet 1937, 92–3 (against Jugie), Frend 1972, 253–4, Kannengiesser and Stein 2001. For a judicious summary of the debate see Stein 1949, 233–5, Allen and Hayward 2004, 37–8, 46–9, van Rompay 2005, 253–4; Grillmeier ii.2, 25–6/25–6, 83–116/79–111, who argues that the dispute was the result of a terminological dispute in uncharted doctrinal territory, offers a fuller treatment. Kugener 1904, 275–7, gives the text and a French translation of this chapter.

115 Eutyches had advocated an extreme form of Miaphysitism in the period leading up to the Council of Chalcedon, obscuring completely the human aspect of Christ’s nature. See PZ iii n.11.

church was,¹¹⁶ he made a speech against Dyophysitism, but he did not stick to [the point] simply, without fault.¹¹⁷ Nevertheless, this skilled champion Severus concealed this realisation¹¹⁸ when he learned [of it], lest when he made a correction, the house would be divided against itself, [102] and he would alienate loved ones, which no one [should] separate, just so that Julian should receive an appropriate reproof when he was striving [against the Dyophysites].¹¹⁹

b. *After Julian wrote to the eloquent Severus, the holy one replied to him twice but he was not persuaded.*¹²⁰ While thus was added instance to instance, which our Lord accomplished, *it forced the matter to be revealed and the error explained* so that [through] the eloquence of Severus the virtue of the true faith might be revealed for the profit of those who were discerning and for those who are lovers of doctrine. In order [to explain] how the point of contention arose, I have set down the letters that one after the other inform the reader in the following chapters of this ninth discourse.¹²¹

116 This passage supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.27 (298b/225). Michael's introduction is somewhat lengthier than PZ's and more forthright in its condemnation of Julian, comparing him to Mani, Marcion and Bardaisan, rather than Eutyches.

117 As noted above, Julian was acquainted with Severus. As PZ here indicates, his quarrel with Severus began in the course of his efforts to argue against the Chalcedonians: see Draguet 1924, 11–12. The work here mentioned by PZ, the 'treatise against the Dyophysites' (i.e. Chalcedonians) may well be identical to the tome produced by Julian, in which he collected all the patristic texts that supported his position; this he sent to Severus along with the first letter (see below), in order to have his arguments validated. See Draguet 1924, 11–18. Among the proof texts he collected were extracts from Severus' own *Philalêthês*; see Grillmeier ii.2, 83/79–80.

118 Cf. Proverbs 10.14.

119 I.e. Severus did not wish to cause division by correcting Julian's disquisition, in case he should cause a division within the anti-Chalcedonian church over a matter that no one else had discovered, and which might be perceived as a condemnation of Julian, who was after all a zealous contender against the Chalcedonians. This also emerges from the correspondence of the two men; see Draguet 1924, 19–20.

120 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.27 (299b/225). As HB 233 n.1 put it, 'All the remainder of this chapter is exceedingly obscure.'

121 PZ offers a selection from the correspondence between the two churchmen, cf. Mich. Syr. ix.27 (298–304b/224–35), *CPG* 7026. The original correspondence was of course in Greek, but only Syriac versions survive. The fuller version was translated by Paul of Callinicum in 528 and contained three letters from each disputant. PZ's version represents an independent translation, which is less complete and faithful to the original, as far as we can tell. See Draguet 1924, 13 n.1. The exchange of letters took place most probably in 520, and thus PZ's placing of the episode (like that of the Samaritan revolt) is misleading; see Maspero 1923, 88 n.5, Draguet 1924, 24–5.

a. The tenth chapter, concerning the first letter of Julian to Severus, with a question about the body of Christ.¹²²

‘Certain men have appeared here who are saying that the body of our Lord was corruptible, while making use of testimonies from the holy Cyril; the first [of these] is what he wrote to Succensus, saying, “After the resurrection, that body that had suffered became incorruptible, there being no longer any human illnesses that [afflicted] it.”¹²³ From this they want to show that before the resurrection [the body] was corrupted, since he was of our nature, but that after the resurrection he received incorruptibility. The second [testimony] is from the [letter] that he wrote to Emperor Theodosius, saying, [103] “It is a wonder and a miracle that the body that by nature [was susceptible] to corruption rose without corruption.”¹²⁴

b. While they have said things such as these [based on] excerpts,¹²⁵ I have set down the entire passage, striving to demonstrate that the opinion [is held] by many teachers.¹²⁶ They brought me his sixty-seventh discourse, which he composed concerning the holy virgin birthgiver of God, in which [it is stated that] “The body of our Lord was in no way subjected to corruption that is from sin, but was susceptible to real¹²⁷ death and burial, by which he destroyed [these two things],” but I thought that it was a mistake in the transcription.¹²⁸ Therefore, in order that the dispute might be resolved by our being examined by you, I sent to you these [things] that I have written, and I

122 Cf. Sev. *Pol.* i, 6–7/5–6 (Paul’s tr.). This letter probably accompanied the treatise (see n.117 above): see Draguet 1924, 13.

123 Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria (412–444) was the touchstone of the anti-Chalcedonian movement; cf. PZ iii n.15. The quotation is from Cyril, *ep.* 1 to Succensus, ed. and tr. Wickham, 80–1, tr. McGuckin, 357.

124 Cyril, *De Rect. Fid. Ad Theod. Imp.* 22 in ACO i.1, p.56.5–6, tr. Bardenhewer, 37, although there is no ‘without corruption’ in Cyril. The risk in such a line was that it tended to make Christ more than human, cf. Severus, *Coll.*, *ep.* 1 (to Oecumenius), from 508/11 (*PO* 12 [1919], 182–3) with Lebon 1951, 559–62, Allen and Hayward 2004, 37–8.

125 Sev. *Pol.* i, 6.14, ‘And they have mutilated (or broken off, Syr. *psaqw*) [the text], saying such things...’; Hespel translates ‘après les avoir mutilés;’ PZ’s expression is *breshê* ‘in headings,’ ‘in excerpts.’

126 Sev. *Pol.* i, 6.14–15, ‘But I, citing the entire passage, have taken care to clarify [its] thought based on the totality of [its contents].’

127 Sev. *Pol.* i, 6, omits.

128 The passage continues (Sev. *Pol.* i, 6.20–21): ‘and is explained thus: not that he “was susceptible to death and burial,” but rather “to his own death and burial.”’ PZ’s text implies that Cyril was also the author of this extract, whereas in fact it is drawn from Severus’ own *Hom.* 67 in *PO* 8 (1912), 358–9, cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 47, dating the sermon to 2 February 515 and noting how close it came to Julian’s (later) views; cf. Sev. *Pol.* iii, 135–6/112–13, for a detailed defence of this passage.

am convinced that our fathers agree with them.¹²⁹ Write to me immediately, so that I may know which opinion I should hold in these [matters] because I do not think that it is right to say that¹³⁰ [the body of Christ] which was not corrupted was susceptible to corruption, and pray that our life may be in [accord with] the grace of God.’¹³¹

a. The eleventh chapter [contains] the response that Severus wrote to this letter of Julian, as follows.¹³²

‘When I first received Your Piety’s letter, I rejoiced as I usual[ly do] at your delightful greeting. Since in it you urged me to read the tome that you sent with it, which was written by you to those who, you have said, have the opinion concerning the body of our Lord and our God Jesus Christ our saviour which states that it was corruptible, and you asked me to write [104] a criticism of it, and send it to your God-loving self, obeying you I have readily done these [things, I] who am a man who moves from one place to another, and do not have a convenient time even for other [things] that are necessary.¹³³ Nevertheless, as [far as] it was possible for [things] to be written, I have written. I have collected [evidence] partly from memory of the teaching of the fathers, and partly from the few volumes of theirs that are found here. For I know indeed that there [arose] a similar inquiry in the royal city, and with demonstrations from the fathers which were made by me, I settled the controversy and the dispute.¹³⁴ Therefore, because there has appeared to me

129 Sev. *Pol.* i, 7.1–3, ‘So that the matter that is in dispute may be decided accurately, I have sent these [things] that have been written by me [probably Julian’s tome or treatise]. Therefore, examine what agrees with inspired [lit. ‘said in the Spirit’] Scripture best, for I know well that the fathers followed this [i.e., Scripture].’ This and the previous passages give the impression that PZ has tried to characterise Julian as more arrogant and overreaching than his actual letter implies, especially with this last passage in which ‘the fathers’, according to PZ, agree with Julian, while the text in Paul of Callinicum’s translation (in Sev. *Pol.*) reads ‘with Scripture.’

130 Vat. syr. 140, 2f (= BL Add. 17,200 4d), printed in Draguet 1924, 7*, reads ‘I do not think that it is said that ...’ implying that the author doubts the accuracy of the report about Julian.

131 See n.117 above: Julian refers here to his tome. Julian’s impatience for a positive signal from Severus is clear, but the patriarch waited five months before replying: see Draguet 1924, 20.

132 Cf. Sev. *Pol.* i, 8–9/6–7. There are several minor differences between PZ and Hespel’s edition.

133 Severus alludes to how busy he was in Egypt as the rallying point of opponents of Chalcedon: see Draguet 1924, 10–11 and Allen and Hayward 2004, 25–7.

134 Severus alludes to earlier discussions on this topic in Constantinople at the time when he and Julian campaigned against Macedonius: see Frend 1972, 253, Grillmeier ii.2, 83/79–80, PZ vii.7–8 above.

in what you are writing something that is not appropriate, [and] because I find that teachers of the holy church from time to time instructed me differently concerning these [matters], I have delayed in sending to Your Piety, as was right, these [things] that I have written, lest some who are ignorant think that this discussion is a dispute between us, and others suppose that it is a fight, even though it is a discussion abounding in love, as I knew it would be. Then make known to me immediately whatever is fitting for you concerning these [matters], for I am ready to accomplish anything that is agreeable to Your Charity, having as my basis the word of the apostle, who says, "Let everything that is done by you be done with love."¹³⁵

a. The twelfth chapter is the second letter of Julian to Severus, the response to [Severus'] reply.¹³⁶

'You wrote [105] that there appeared to you something that was not appropriate in the [letter] that I had written, but you should have immediately made [it] known to me in a letter and released me from anxiety. I think that in all the [things] that I have written I have truthfully confessed the embodiment [of Christ] that was from our [nature], and I have been diligent to demonstrate that the fathers agreed with each other,¹³⁷ for I do not think that it is possible for us to believe and to maintain that what is corruptible and what is incorruptible are the same [thing]. While we confess to be passible him who by his scourgings healed everyone, we know that he is greater and is exalted above the passions. Even though he was mortal, we confess that he trampled upon death, and gave life to mortals through his death.

b. Thus you have only caused me anxiety when you said that I have written something that is not appropriate and you did not inform me what it is so that I may explain it.¹³⁸ Condescend to write to me that which is said in

135 The quotation comes from 1 Corinthians 16.14. Severus indicates that he has composed a reply to Julian's tome, a work that he later passed on to Thomas of Alexandria for dissemination in an effort to rebut Julian's work. See Draguet 1924, 20–1.

136 Cf. Sev. *Pol.* i, 10–11/8–9.

137 BL Add. 17,200 reads: 'and I took care to show in the things that were said by the fathers, that they agreed with one another,' given in Draguet 1924, 6*. Sev. *Pol.* i, 10.17–19, has 'And I believe that after pursuing the way of the fathers, they contradict neither themselves nor one another.'

138 Julian complains about the vagueness of Severus' response. As noted above (n.135), Severus had in fact composed a more specific rebuttal of Julian's work, but forbore from sending it, in the vain hope that the controversy would die down. See Draguet 1924, 20–1.

the fathers, in Athanasius,¹³⁹ in Cyril, and in the others, for I want to know your intention. I think that I have followed the model of the fathers, who were neither contradictory to themselves nor to one another, just as in [the case of] Paul, who said that salvation is not from deeds, but from faith,¹⁴⁰ and James, who said that “Faith without deeds is dead.”¹⁴¹ They said these things not in opposition to one another; rather they are in agreement, but pray¹⁴² that we be illuminated by God and not give in to our emotion, since you show us the matter in brief. The holy Cyril writes, “It is not easy for us to say that corruption could ever be able [106] to take hold of the flesh that was united to the word [of God],” and five lines [later], “It is a wonder and a miracle that the body that by nature [was susceptible] to corruption was raised.”¹⁴³ What is the thought that he wishes to demonstrate, if with these [statements] he was not thinking of the common [meaning of] “natural corruption”? For he did not [intend to] contradict himself with these [statements];¹⁴⁴ for he bore our infirmities according to his will, and not out of the necessity of nature, and he lifted up our sins in his body upon the wood, though he was dead to our sins.’¹⁴⁵

a. The thirteenth chapter is the reply of Severus to this letter of Julian’s.¹⁴⁶ ‘It seemed very strange to me, when I call to memory the few [words] that

139 Although the MS refers to Theodosius, Paul of Callinicum gives ‘Athanasius’, which is more probable, since Athanasius (patriarch of Alexandria, 328–373) was a highly respected theologian. We thus follow Brooks’ emendation here.

140 Cf. Romans 3.28.

141 James 2.20.

142 This passage, as printed in Draguet 1924, 5*–6*, reads, ‘by God ... you make known to us in a remark and in a few lines, from the pastor Cyril, who is among the saints, who wrote that “It is not permitted to say that corruption ...” What argument can show that he did not struggle with the body [Sev. *Pol.* i, 11.5–6: ‘who did not struggle with himself’], unless that [body] that was joined to him is, by its common nature, corruptible? [For he is the one] who endured suffering and tasted illnesses willingly and not out of the necessity of [his] nature, and raised up [our] sins in his body on the cross, while he was dead to sin – this understood to be our [sin].’

143 The quotation comes from Cyril, *De Rect. Fid. ad Theod.* 21 in *ACO* i.1, p.55.31–2, tr. Bardenhewer, 36. For the second passage see above n.124.

144 Julian makes clear his fundamental point here: Christ chose voluntarily to suffer rather than being obliged to do so by having taken mortal flesh. He took this stance probably on the grounds that if Christ were held to have suffered (normally), then he must have had a sinful nature, which was clearly unacceptable. See Jugie 1925, 263, Grillmeier ii.2, 104–5/100–1.

145 The final sentence bears some resemblance to Cyril, *De Rect. Fid. ad Theod.* 21, *ACO* i.1, p.55.21–2 (tr. Bardenhewer, 36), but incorporates allusions to Isaiah 53.4, Matthew 8.17, 1 Peter 2.24.

146 Cf. Sev. *Pol.* i, 12–19/9–14.

I wrote, that the love of God that is in you said that [you were] in great anxiety, though I performed your request for no other reason than to make you not anxious and without concern. If you had sent me a small question or problem, perhaps then I might have used a few words in making a reply. Yet since it is a tome of many sections and an altogether extensive work that you have sent me to examine, having considered everything that is in it, according to my ability I shall reveal to you my thought.¹⁴⁷

b. Concerning these [matters] there is much that I can readily do for Your Piety, and [to demonstrate] that I am not lying, hear these [words] that you wrote, as follows. “I have sent these things that I have written as an understanding of the dispute, but check whether these [statements] agree with the Holy Scriptures, because I think that our fathers were in agreement with these [statements]. Write to me that opinion which [107] I should hold.” Since you have given me an occasion for much discussion, how can you require me in your second letter to make mention of many [things] in a few lines and in one statement about that which requires many statements and demonstrations from the *blessed*¹⁴⁸ fathers who, as you have said, spoke these [words] while being inspired by God? For the Holy Scripture said, “The Lord is he who teaches understanding and knowledge,”¹⁴⁹ and in another place, “The Lord has given wisdom, and before him are knowledge and understanding, and he gives salvation to the upright.”¹⁵⁰ Thus if we and Your Piety are diligent concerning these fathers who were not in contradiction with one another, there is nothing to prevent [us] from carefully examining [them] and from knowing that in no way have they ever shown themselves either to be in contradiction with one another or in self-[contradiction]. For you have correctly and rightly said that the teachers do not contradict one another, just as Paul [does not contradict] James. The former says that “A person is justified through faith and not through deeds;” the latter writes that “Faith without deeds is dead.”¹⁵¹ Paul spoke concerning the faith that is before baptism, the perfection of which is in confession [of the faith] with a pure heart. Since [such faith] did not previously show good deeds in the world, it becomes justified through believing, confessing, and being baptised. James said that faith without deeds after baptism is dead, if

147 Severus alludes to the complexity of dealing with Julian’s entire tome, as he further explains in his third letter (not in PZ), cf. Draguet 1924, 24–5. See n.117 above.

148 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.27 (301b/230).

149 Cf. Job 21.22, Daniel 2.21.

150 Proverbs 2.6–7. LXX Peshitta, following the Masoretic text reads, ‘and from his mouth’ for ‘before him.’

151 See nn.140–1 above on the citations from Paul and James.

one does not confirm [108] it with upright action. For baptism is a pledge of good conduct, because even our Lord, our instructor, when he had sanctified the waters, had been baptised by John, and had given us the source of baptism, went up the mountain and accepted the challenge of the tempter and dissolved all his power, leading us to know that after the divine cleansing we must demonstrate a contest through actions, and struggle according to the law with the adversary while displaying our virtues.¹⁵²

c. Someone might object, saying, “Yet Paul took Abraham as a demonstration that a person is justified through faith and not through deeds, saying, ‘Therefore, they who are in the faith are blessed through the believing Abraham,’ and ‘The faith of him who without deed[s] believed in the one who is able to justify sinners is counted as righteousness for him.’¹⁵³ Yet James demonstrates from the same Abraham that no one is justified by faith alone, but through deeds confirming faith.¹⁵⁴ So how do they not contradict one another? It is the same Abraham who is a demonstration for those who did not work but believe, and for those who manifested faith through deeds.” I am ready to explain [this] from the Holy Scriptures. For one who investigates the periods of Abraham’s life [will see] that he was a model for both of these [things, namely] the faith that is before baptism, confessing salvation while believing in the Messiah, and [the faith] that is after baptism, joined with the deeds that are a demonstration of the former circumcision of the flesh that drives away the denial of uncircumcision, and draws us [109] near to the adoption of God, for which [reason] Moses was also commanded to say to Pharaoh, “You, say to Pharaoh, ‘My son, my first-born, is Israel.’”¹⁵⁵ Therefore Paul writes to the Colossians, saying, “In him you have been circumcised with a circumcision that is not by our hands, [but] through the putting off of the flesh of sins and in the circumcision of Christ, you who

152 Severus argues that baptism accounts for the difference between the two: a different standard of behaviour is expected of a Christian after baptism. Severus appears to devote excessive attention to accounting for the apparent discrepancy between James and Paul, given that it was merely cited as an analogy by Julian; in the next paragraph (section c below) he claims that it is out of a desire to prove that there are no contradictions in Scripture. We may suspect rather that Severus was seeking to avoid the issue (cf. Draguet 1924, 22), that is of replying directly to Julian’s queries; as we learn in the last paragraph, he had already in fact composed a rebuttal of his work. Cf. Basil, *ep.* 134 (to Paeonius), in which he likewise does not answer his correspondent until the end of the letter.

153 Galatians 3.9, Romans 4.5. Cf. Romans 3.28, Galatians 2.16, Ephesians 2.8–9.

154 James 2.21–24. A Greek version of this discussion, in a somewhat different form, may be found in *Catena in epistolas catholicas*, 16–17, tr. in Bray 2000, 32.

155 Exodus 4.22.

have been buried with him in baptism.”¹⁵⁶ Therefore [Paul] said concerning Abraham that he was justified through faith without deeds, though he was [still in a state of] uncircumcision before he was circumcised, indicating the profession [of faith] that is before baptism, [which is also] without deeds. For he said when writing to the Romans, “For his faith was counted to Abraham as righteousness. How? Not through circumcision, but in [the state of] uncircumcision.”¹⁵⁷ He did not lie, for the word of Moses is a witness, saying concerning God who said to Abraham, “‘Look into heaven and count the stars, if you are able to count them,’ and [God] said, ‘So shall your seed be,’ and Abraham believed God, and it was counted to Abraham for righteousness.”¹⁵⁸

d. James took the same Abraham as a demonstration of the faith that saves through deeds after baptism. For when he was circumcised and was no [longer in the state of] uncircumcision, we have what we learn from the Book, in which it is written, “Have you sought [in order] to know, O human, that faith without deeds is dead? For our father Abraham was justified through deeds, when he lifted up Isaac his son as a holocaust: you see that faith aided his deeds but through deeds he was perfected, and the Book was fulfilled, which said, [110] ‘Abraham believed in God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called his friend.’”¹⁵⁹ It is easy for anyone who reads the book of Moses to learn from the book of Genesis that after Abraham was circumcised he lifted up Isaac as a holocaust and fulfilled the command and became righteous through deeds, giving us the model for faith that is after baptism, which is a rational circumcision, which through deeds justifies a person. For it is written that “Abraham was circumcised, and his son Ishmael, and all the sons of his house, and all those purchased with money who were from the foreign nations.”¹⁶⁰ Then God, testing Abraham, said, “Take your son whom you love, Isaac, and go to high ground, and bring him up there as a holocaust.”¹⁶¹ Accordingly, it does not appear that these [words] of the two apostles and those written in the old law contradict one another; rather, they are one, and from the one Spirit they were spoken concerning the faith that is from before baptism, which only by a small confession that is not an action justifies the one

156 Colossians 2.11–12.

157 Romans 4.9–10.

158 Genesis 15.5–6.

159 James 2.20–23.

160 Genesis 17.26–27.

161 Genesis 22.2.

who presents himself, baptism being the fullness of salvation if he should immediately depart from the world. Faith that is after baptism is different, for it requires of someone a demonstration of good deeds, and also raises one to the measure of perfection and to a high status. Therefore James said quite properly concerning this, that faith is made perfect through deeds, since the wise Paul also teaches in another place with similar [words] concerning the faith [111] that through deeds [it] is made perfect. For the Galatians, after having been baptised and counted as sons of God from the Spirit, reverted to Judaism and were being circumcised, vainly supposing that through the circumcision of their flesh they had something greater in the Messiah than those who were uncircumcised. [Paul] wrote, chastising them, saying, ‘In Jesus Christ neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, [but] rather faith that is worked through love.’¹⁶² Therefore, from this it is evident that the faith after baptism, accompanied by action joined and coupled with love, is effective and salvific. What is work that is [joined] with love? Paul explains this, saying, “Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous, excited, puffed-up or ashamed; it neither seeks its own nor does it become angry; it does not recall [that which is] evil and does not rejoice over iniquity; but it rejoices over the truth, and hopes for all and accepts all; love does not suddenly fall off.”¹⁶³ Who dares to find fault with these [virtues], namely correct labour, action, and toil that are joined to faith, so that many may profit and be saved? For with regard to this our Lord said, “If you love me, keep my commandments.”¹⁶⁴

e. Therefore, as in the [same] manner that the Holy Scriptures and our fathers consistently instruct us, so have they instructed in concord those who do not read carelessly concerning this question, for because of this it is also written, “Everything is known to those with understanding, and is straightforward to those who find knowledge.”¹⁶⁵ This I have been diligent to send explicitly to Your Charity, as is right for Christians. Yet because I have learned from many parts that you have given out the text [112] of your document that was written to me, not only in the great city of Alexandria, but also in various places, I have sent [a message] again with love, being convinced that I am in agreement with Christ God, the lawgiver, and have written to our brother Thomas the presbyter not to give out our treatise, but

162 Galatians 5.6. On this discussion of circumcision and Paul’s views see (e.g.) Stummer 1954, 164–6.

163 1 Corinthians 1.4–8.

164 John 14.15.

165 Proverbs 8.9.

to keep it to himself, because I am hoping that these [writings] of mine and of Your Holiness, though from the counsel of two [persons], will become known as though from one mouth and soul.¹⁶⁶ For in this manner I once and twice examined the teaching of the bishops of worthy memory, Philoxenus and Eleusinus, and the books of a speculative nature that they composed on the faith, but I did not find in them anything which clarified these [letters of ours addressed] to one another in love while we were debating, when through the help of the Lord we agreed mutually as though one.¹⁶⁷ For I have never published either a book or a treatise so as to be seen among people or to become famous beyond the measure of my frailty, but rather for the sake of the accuracy of the gospel according to the teaching and the legislation of the apostles.¹⁶⁸ However, it is not appropriate for us at a time like this to abandon the struggle with heretics in order to quarrel in writing with one another,¹⁶⁹ lest the word of the apostle be fulfilled against us, who said, “If you bite one another and eat one another, watch out lest you are consumed by one another.”¹⁷⁰ From disputes like these it is fitting for those who love our Lord to flee with all their strength and to love one another in order that peace may abound and may visit the Israel of God. Greet your brotherhood that is with you; that which is with me reveres you in our Lord.’

f. When Julian received also this letter from the eloquent [113] Severus, he became very indignant and was enraged. He wrote saying that [his request] had been refused by [Severus] for a year and a month, and that he had not appreciated his [due] honour and had been cheated.¹⁷¹ Then Severus wrote again a long treatise that abounded in demonstrations of the true teachers of the holy church, who said that the body of Christ that he had

166 Severus was understandably vexed to learn that Julian had not waited for his approval before circulating his tome. He had evidently feared such a development, which was why he had sent a copy of his own rebuttal to Thomas in Alexandria, no doubt so as to be ready to copy it and circulate it, should the need arise. Nevertheless, he had held off at least until this point, in the hope that the refutation should not be needed. See Draguet 1924, 21–2.

167 Severus thus prefers discussions among anti-Chalcedonians to remain limited in circulation, a policy that had worked earlier with Philoxenus (on whom see PZ vii n.176) and Eleusinus, bishop of Sasima. On the former, and similarities between his writings and those of Julian, see Draguet 1924, 232–50; on the latter, see Honigmann 1951, 114–16.

168 Severus defends himself for having produced extensive refutations of those who had incorrectly interpreted Scripture. It is unclear which two works exactly are meant; on Severus’ dogmatical works before 520 see Allen and Hayward 2004, 39–46.

169 Cf. Frend 1972, 254, on the difficulties caused for the anti-Chalcedonians by these internal divisions.

170 Galatians 5.15.

171 PZ here alludes to Julian’s third letter: see Draguet 1924, 23.

taken from [our nature] was susceptible to innocent passions except sin until the resurrection, and for this reason, in order that it may be known, I have copied out above these letters for the discerning.¹⁷² There were many books [addressed] to Julian, Felicissimus, Romanus, and other persons [agreeing] with [Julian's] opinion, in which there is much material for profit through study for those who are lovers of doctrine.¹⁷³ They became known to those of the true party of the faith, who concerning the embodiment of our saviour are astute and intelligent, and they preserved and made wise those who are simple, especially the monks, so that they [might] not become Eutychians.¹⁷⁴

a. The fourteenth chapter of the ninth book is about the riot that happened in Constantinople and how Hypatius and Pompeius were killed and many people were slaughtered in the circus.¹⁷⁵

In the tenth [indiction] year, it was not enough that a multitude of Huns waged war, invading Roman [territory], scorching [it], and killing many whom they found in the countryside, as has been recorded above, but also many perished in the riot that took place in the royal city. For when John of Caesarea in Cappadocia became the *hyparchus* there he amassed a large [quantity] of gold from all classes, from both the nobility and from artisans, for the royal treasury, through carefully creating pretexts against

172 PZ summarises Severus' third letter: see Draguet 1924, 29. It was essentially a summary of the lengthier rebuttal he had earlier sent to Thomas at Alexandria.

173 On Severus' works against Julian see n.121 above. Little survives of Severus' attacks upon Felicissimus (*CPG* 7032), so Draguet 1924, 80, Allen and Hayward 2004, 49. Athanasius, *Conflict of Severus*, *PO* 4 (1907), 611–12, alludes to Severus' work, cf. the Arabic version of this work, *PO* 49 (2004), 404–5. Sev. *Hom. Cath.* 119 in *PO* 26 (1948), 375–439 represents his attack on 'The Ladder of Romanus', delivered in 518: see Draguet 1924, 80–1, Allen and Hayward 2004, 48.

174 PZ glosses over the deep splits in the anti-Chalcedonian party caused by Julian's work, on which see Frend 1972, 262–3, Maraval 1998b, 401.

175 The Nika riot, as it was known from the cries of 'Nika' or 'Victory' of the circus partisans, devastated much of the imperial capital in January 532. Its origins lay in the determination of Justinian to clamp down on these partisans, whereas formerly he had allowed great licence to the Blue faction. A bungled execution led to the unification of the Blues and Greens, the two major factions, and, in due course, to their acclamation of Hypatius as an emperor to replace Justinian. Our other chief sources are Proc. *Wars* i.24, Mal. 18.71, *Chr. Pasch.* 620.13–629.6, Theoph. 181.24–31, 184.3–186.2, Marc. *com.* a.532. For a detailed account see Evans 1996, 119–25, Greatrex 1997, Meier 2003b, Evans 2005, 15–20. While earlier interpretations see Justinian as the somewhat hapless victim of events at the start of the uprising, Meier argues that the riot was provoked and deliberately escalated by the emperor in order to flush out opposition groups.

certain persons [114] [through] trickery¹⁷⁶ and deceit there and in various cities. [Those] in the palace listened to him, and he was feared by everyone because he had boldness of speech with the emperor, accused many, and was surrounded by flatterers and informers.¹⁷⁷ There, in the imperial city, was a not insignificant [number] of people from every place¹⁷⁸ that came forward against him and that favoured and supported one of the factions.¹⁷⁹ For this [reason] there were [constant] outcries against him and against the emperor. The factions united and were in agreement with one another for several days, and the workshops were closed and they began to plunder and to burn whatever they could find. The emperor became alarmed, and finally the palace was closed. The parties assembled in the circus and made a large protest, crying out that Hypatius should become emperor and if not they would burn the city. Hypatius was compelled to come out, and Pompey accompanied him.¹⁸⁰ They took a necklace from one of the soldiers and placed it on his head and enthroned him as emperor, crying out to him and praising him.¹⁸¹

b. When this had happened, on the advice of [some] people, a fire was

176 This word seems to occur only here and at vii.7b and is not present in the *Thesaurus*. Brockelmann refers only to the occurrence in vii.7b, and translates it as 'cogitavit, spectavit'; we have followed HB 245 n.5 in our translation.

177 The fact that PZ pins the blame on John the Cappadocian, the praetorian prefect (*hyparchus*), shows that his version postdates John's fall from power in 541. The first accounts of the riot attribute the responsibility to Hypatius and Pompey, but the official line later changed in order to discredit John. A very similar description of John's pre-eminence and unpopularity is presented by Joh. Lyd. *De Mag.* iii.69–70. See Greatrex 1995, 4–5, idem 1997, 60–1.

178 PZ is correct about the influx of people to Constantinople, cf. Joh. Lyd. *de Mag.* iii.70, Stein 1949, 448–9. In 539 Justinian set up a new post of *quaesitor* in order to deal with the large numbers of immigrants to the city, cf. Stein 1949, 455–6, Greatrex 1997, 60–1.

179 PZ refers to the people supporting one of the factions (using the Gk. term *meros*). According to Joh. Lyd. *De Mag.* iii.62, John supported the Greens as a means to secure the throne, although it is doubtful whether these allegations deserve any credence, since they seem to reflect, as noted above, an official line developed in the early 540s after John's disgrace.

180 The factions united on 10 January and proceeded to devastate much of the city over the following week. PZ telescopes events here: Hypatius remained in the palace with Justinian until the day before his acclamation by the populace, Sunday 18 January. On that day the partisans, having come upon Hypatius and Pompey, led them to the hippodrome in order to acclaim the elder brother emperor. Proc. also stresses the unwillingness of Hypatius to accept the acclamation of the crowd; in his account, he begs the emperor not to release him from the palace (*Wars* i.24.20).

181 For this detail cf. Proc. *Wars* i.24.24: Hypatius' supporters could find no diadem with which to crown him, when they acclaimed him at the Forum of Constantine, and had to use a necklace instead.

set in the Great Church there, so that when [news of] the terrible event was heard, the people who were assembled would be scattered, for Emperor Justinian was distressed and alarmed in the palace.¹⁸² Mundus, a general, and his army were present there, and he, the *scholarii*, and the army that was present there were commanded to close the gates of the circus and slaughter and kill all of the classes that they found there.¹⁸³ No one was able to flee and escape the sword, and more than 80,000 individuals perished there in that protest.¹⁸⁴ Hypatius and Pompey were finally seized, and they entered before [115] the emperor, and when he understood the [matter], he wanted to spare the men, but he was not able [to do so] because his consort, enraged, swore by God and by him and made him promise that the men be killed.¹⁸⁵ They were sent out to the sea, were killed, and were thrown into it.¹⁸⁶

a. The fifteenth chapter is about the faithful bishops who were recalled from exile to the imperial city and gave a deposition¹⁸⁷ concerning their faith

182 This is incorrect: Hagia Sophia had already been burnt in the night of 14–15 January: see Greatrex 1997, 85. On the other hand, Proc. Wars i.24.32 (cf. Theoph. 184.27–30) confirms Justinian's discomfiture in the palace, and other sources report that he was prepared to abandon the city, cf. Greatrex 1997, 78.

183 Mundus was among the commanders who took part in the massacre of the assembled partisans in the hippodrome on 18 January; also involved were Narses and Belisarius.

184 For a survey of the various figures given for the number of dead see Greatrex 1997, 79. PZ's figure is on the high side, but clearly tens of thousands perished.

185 PZ's portrayal of the denouement is curious, since one would expect an anti-Chalcedonian writer to offer a favourable picture of Theodora. According to *Chr. Pasch.* 627 (cf. 624 and Proc. Wars i.24.56), Hypatius justified himself to Justinian after being apprehended, declaring that he had fulfilled his role and assembled the partisans in the circus, a statement that does imply a certain connivance between the two men, cf. Greatrex 1997, 79. No other source claims that Theodora insisted upon the execution of the two brothers, although Proc. Wars i.24.33–9 describes how, earlier in the riot, the empress stiffened the emperor's resolve to stand firm (a part of his account that is not generally believed, however, for good reason, on which see [e.g.] Evans 1996, 24 and Meier 2004a); Foss 2002, 152–3, is somewhat less sceptical. See also Evans 2002, 47, on PZ here.

186 On the execution of the two brothers at the seashore on Monday 19 January see Proc. Wars i.24.56; Vict. Ton. §14, p.37 (a.530) claims that they were killed in the night and their corpses thrown into the Bosphorus. According to *Chr. Pasch.* 627–8, the body of Hypatius was washed up soon afterwards and eventually buried by his family. See also *Anth. Gr.* vii.591–2, verses commemorating Hypatius, with Cameron 1978, 264–7 and *PLRE* ii, Hypatius 7.

187 At the summary at the start of the book PZ refers to the bishops' petition as a *deêsis* (89.17), whereas here he uses the Syriac term *pyana*. See Brock 1981, 88 n.7, on other terms used for the document in the sources. Menze 2008a, 60 n.13, refers to it as a *plêrophoria*, as it is described in H (see next note), section 1 (Brock 1981, 92–3).

to the emperor, which is as follows.¹⁸⁸

‘Various other men crown your believing head, O victorious emperor, with crowns of praises, those who on the pretext of other [matters] take the opportunity to write a word concerning your favours towards them. We, who have been deemed worthy of the adoration of your virtues, receive

188 In 532 (the precise date is uncertain, cf. n.220 below) a group of anti-Chalcedonian bishops, Sergius of Cyrrhus, Thomas of Germanicia, Philoxenus of Dulichium, Peter of Resh'aina, John of Tella and either Nonnus of Circesium or Thomas of Dara (the sources vary, cf. Brock 1981, 117–18, Menze 2008a, 154 n.40), came to Constantinople at the emperor's behest to discuss with Chalcedonian bishops how to reconcile the two sides. The Chalcedonian bishops were Hypatius of Ephesus, Stephen of Seleucia Isauria, Innocentius of Maroneia, John of Bizye and Anthimus of Trebizond. Three days of negotiations, on the last of which Justinian took an active part, yielded no progress. We are fortunate to have a record of the talks from both the Chalcedonian and the Miaphysite sides, the former in a Latin translation of a letter of Innocentius of Maroneia in *ACO* iv.2, pp.169–84, the latter in a summary (from BL Add. 12,155, fols.110–11) first published by Nau in *PO* 13 (1919), 192–6 (referred to as S and available in a revised translation in Brock 1981, 113–17) and in a subsequently discovered manuscript which offers a more detailed but fragmentary account of proceedings, edited and translated by Brock 1981, 91–113; it may be the work of John bar Aphtonia, who was also present at the discussions, as PZ relates. While PZ has no record of the actual debates, he is the only source to preserve the doctrinal statement prepared by the bishops in advance of their meeting: see Brock 1981, 88, noting references to the document in the other sources. The document was handed over to the emperor upon the arrival of the anti-Chalcedonians in Constantinople; according to the account edited by Brock (referred to as H), section 1, p.93, Justinian expressed doubts as to whether he would read it, but handed it over to Hypatius of Ephesus in order for him to use as a basis for discussion. See Uthemann 1999, 28. From the records, it is clear that it did play a significant role in the talks, especially on the second day, cf. Brock 1981, 89, when it was read aloud by the anti-Chalcedonians (H section 12, Brock 1981, 96–7). Despite the failure of the three days of negotiations, it seems as though talks continued, since PZ refers to discussions being pursued for a year (*pace* Speigl 1984, 284–5; see below); Mich. Syr. ix.22 (281–6/196–205), who reproduces PZ's account, goes on to describe further visits of anti-Chalcedonians to the capital that may have taken place around this time, cf. PD ii, 133/119 (on Egyptians in the capital, apparently dated to 557/8, but perhaps misplaced, cf. Witakowski 1996a, 119 n.506, an account incorporated by Mich. Syr., *loc. cit.*). For detailed analysis see Frend 1972, 264–7, Brock 1981, 117–21, Speigl 1984, Noethlichs 2001, 690, Uthemann 1999, 27–33 (with bibliography), Grillmeier ii.2, 244–62/231–48, Leppin 2007, 194–8, Menze 2008a, 58–67, 94–101. A slightly modified version of HB's translation of this chapter is given by Frend 1972, 362–6. The date of these discussions is established by Stein 1949, 378 n.1, i.e. 532; see further n.220 below. Schwartz 1939, 395–6, rightly draws attention to the arrival of other notable anti-Chalcedonians in the capital around this time, such as Peter, the deposed bishop of Apamea, cf. Menze 2008a, 154, Dijkstra and Greatrex 2009, 258–60.

PZ passes over the slackening of the persecution of anti-Chalcedonians c.531, to which he alluded briefly at viii.5c. It is in this context of greater tolerance that the negotiations got underway. See Greatrex 2007b, 289 and n.34 (linking this development to the continuing war with Persia), Menze 2008a, 121–2.

your grace while weaving with splendour a crown of glory. Although we are in the desert, and so to say by this at the end of civilisation, we have been dwelling for a long time in peace, supplicating the good and merciful God during such days as these on behalf of Your Majesty and on behalf of our sins.¹⁸⁹ Your Tranquillity has inclined towards our baseness and has called us to [you] with believing letters, and the thing is a wonder to us, that you did not receive this, our petition, from us with scorn, but rather with the philanthropy for which [you] are known, to bring us¹⁹⁰ out of afflictions, making the pretext that some man or other has interceded on our behalf.

b. We then, because it is necessary for us [116] to obey when we are commanded, immediately left the wilderness, and travelling along the route, in peace, in tranquillity and without our voices being heard, have arrived at your feet, and we beseech God, [who is] rich in gifts, that he bestow on Your Tranquillity and the God-loving Empress good gifts from on high¹⁹¹ for our sake, making you deserving of peace and tranquillity, and [praying] that he place [as] a footstool beneath your feet every rebellious nation.¹⁹² Now that we have arrived, we make a deposition of our true faith to Your Tranquillity, while not wanting to have a word with anyone concerning any [matter] which is not appropriate, as it is written,¹⁹³ lest we annoy your hearing, for it is quite hard for someone to persuade those of contentious will, even if he demonstrates the truth. So, as we have said, we refrain from a dispute with those who are contentious, those who will not accept instructors. For our master the apostle said, “We have no custom such as this, neither does the church of God.”¹⁹⁴ Wherefore, O victorious emperor, we now make known

189 The bishops lay great stress on their loyalty to the emperor, something which could be called into question given that they had refused to sign the *libelli* circulated under Justin I, which required the acceptance of Chalcedon, and had then abandoned their sees. Their persecution at the hands of imperial representatives, on which see Frend 1972, 247–54 and Greatrex 2007b, 289–90, might also have shaken their loyalty; likewise the fact that they were starting to ordain their own clergy, thus crystallising the split with the Chalcedonian church, was regarded by the emperor as suspect. See Brock 1981, document S, sections 1, 4 (114, 115), H, section 10 (96/7), cf. *Vit. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 59–60/39–40, with Speigl 1984, 275, 283, Menze 2008a, 175–86. On the loyalty that survived among opponents of Chalcedon to the empire, despite persecution, see Whitby 1988, 213–15, van Ginkel 1994.

190 Reading with HB 247 n.2.

191 Cf. James 1.17.

192 A reworking of Psalm 109(110).1, but the bishops, alluding no doubt to the Nika riot, replace ‘your enemies’ with ‘every rebellious people’, cf. Schwartz 1939, 389 n.2.

193 Titus 3.9.

194 1 Corinthians 11.16.

the freedom of our faith;¹⁹⁵ and although in the desert when we received your commandment through the *dux* Theodotus,¹⁹⁶ we wrote and made known what we think, Your Majesty gave to us a word in truth, that without offence you were moved in a merciful way, summoning us to You.¹⁹⁷

c. While we were made worthy of the mercy of God by this, we taught Your Fidelity that we by the grace of God from our most tender fingernails¹⁹⁸ have received the faith of the apostles, and in it and with it we were raised, and thus we think and believe, [117] as our holy, God-clad fathers, the 318 of the living faith and salvation wrote down, that which the 150 holy fathers confirmed when they once met here, and which those pious bishops who assembled at Ephesus sealed, removing the wicked Nestorius.¹⁹⁹ Therefore, into this faith of the apostles we were baptised and do baptise, and this understanding of salvation is the measure of our hearts. This same teaching alone we know in our faith, and we have not accepted anything else other than it, because it is perfect in every way, and is not outdated or deficient so that it should be updated.²⁰⁰

d. We confess the worshipful and holy Trinity, equal in nature, *one*²⁰¹ power and honour made known in three persons:²⁰² the Father who is worshipped; his only-begotten Son, God the Word, who before all time was begotten eternally from him, and is with him without change for ever; and the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and is consubstantial with the Father and the Son, being one of the persons²⁰³ of the one holy Trinity. We

195 The 'freedom of our faith' is specifically alluded to in H, section 41 (Brock 1981, 110–11).

196 Theodotus: otherwise unattested. See *PLRE* iii, Theodotus 2, which fails to give the reference to this passage and misdates his mission to 535.

197 From PZ's account, it appears that the bishops had already entered into correspondence with the emperor, having received the summons, and only after obtaining word from him in response to their initial declaration did they set off for the capital. It follows that Justinian entered into contact with the anti-Chalcedonian bishops already in early 531.

198 I.e., from our earliest youth.

199 The bishops refer to the first three ecumenical councils, Nicaea (325), Constantinople (381) and Ephesus I (431). Speigl 1984, 268 interprets the 'here' as indicating that the document was drawn up at Constantinople, which is possible.

200 The bishops reject the need for further precision: Chalcedon, for them, introduced gratuitous and pernicious innovations. See Frend 1972, 212 n.5, citing *Sev. Coll. ep.* 34, *PO* 12 (1915), 272, for criticism of Chalcedon for its innovating tendencies with Lebon 1951, 496–3. See also n.217 below.

201 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.22 (282b/199).

202 Syr. *qnumê*, which is the same word used for the *hypostasis* (or *hypostaseis*) of the incarnate Son of God.

203 Syr. *qnumê*, cf. preceding note.

say that God the Word is he who, by the will of the Father, at the end of days for the sake of the salvation of human beings, became embodied from the Holy Spirit and was born from the holy virgin Birthgiver of God, Mary, a body ensouled with a rational and intelligible soul, passible, and consubstantial with us; and he became a human being but was not changed from that which he was. We confess that while consubstantial with the Father in his divinity he became consubstantial with us in his humanity. He who was the perfect Word, the Son of God, [118] became a perfect human being without change, and there was nothing that was lacking for us in our salvation, as the foolish Apollinarius has said, that the becoming human of God the Word was not perfect, and deprives us, according to his opinion, of those [things] that are essential for our salvation. For if our intellect was not united with him, as [Apollinarius] nonsensically says, then we have not been saved, and have fallen short in salvation of those [things] that are important to us. Yet these [things] are not as he has said, for the perfect God, for our sake, became a perfect human being without change, and God the Word lacked nothing in becoming human, as we have said. Moreover it was not [as a] phantom [that he appeared incarnate], as the wicked Mani and the errant Eutyches supposed.²⁰⁴

e. Because Christ is the truth, he did not know how to lie, and being God did not err. Therefore God the Word truly was embodied, in truth and not in semblance, with natural and innocent passions, such that he, accepting by his will for our sake these [things] in the flesh, was passible, consubstantial with us, and by his will he experienced our own death, which he made for us [into] life by a resurrection befitting God, restoring to human nature [its] former incorruption and immortality. In this manner, God the Word, who left

204 The bishops state quite clearly their views on the Trinity, which are in line with Severus and his interpretation of Cyril. See Frend 1972, 208–11, for a useful summary of Severus' christology; cf. Lebon 1951, 452–91, Allen and Hayward 2004, 34–7 with the extracts from his polemical works at 59–106, Chesnut 1976, 9–56, esp. 36–9, Grillmeier ii.2, 156–83/148–73. Similar points may be found in Severus' two letters to Count Oecumenius, *Coll. ep.* 1–2, *PO* 12 (1915), 175–94. The stress on the perfect humanity of Christ is undoubtedly a reaction to the spread of the doctrines of Julian of Halicarnassus, even though he is not named. Hence also the mention of Apollinarius, whose views subsumed Christ's humanity in his divinity: see Frend 1972, 117–20, on his position (condemned by the Council of Constantinople in 381). The condemnation of Apollinarius, the third-century prophet Mani and Eutyches would have been thoroughly acceptable to Chalcedonians. Cf. Sev. *Coll. ep.* 35, *PO* 12 (1915), 290 – a letter directed to the bishops of the eastern frontier – in which Severus laments that because of Julian's doctrines, all anti-Chalcedonians are viewed by their opponents as favouring 'the semblance of Eutyches, which is the error of the followers of Mani' (tr. Brooks).

nothing wanting and was not a phantom,²⁰⁵ did not divide into two *hypostaseis*²⁰⁶ and two natures [his] becoming embodied and [his] becoming human, as the teaching that Nestorius, the worshipper of a human, invented, [along with] those who at times thought thus, and those who think [so] today.²⁰⁷ The faith [119] of your confession dissolves their teaching and fights with it, because thus you have said in your writing, “God appeared and became flesh, he was in all things like the Father, except for the quality of fatherhood; he became consubstantial with us and was called a human being, the very same one [who] appeared to us and was born [as] an infant because of us, and though he was God to human beings, because of our salvation he became a human being.”²⁰⁸

f. If those who dispute with us adhered to these [things] in truth, and did not want only to think them in appearance,²⁰⁹ but rather consented to believe as we do, as you do, and as our holy God-clad fathers [do], they would desist from this training for combat. For the most wise teachers of the church have plainly stated that Christ was joined in composition, [that is], God the Word being joined in composition to a body ensouled with a rational and intelligible soul. Dionysius the Areopagite,²¹⁰ who from the darkness and error of

205 By becoming truly human, Christ redeemed mankind; again the emphasis is on the reality of Christ’s human nature, in order to ensure that the bishops are not mistaken for adherents of Julian’s doctrines.

206 Syr. *qnumê*, cf. n.202.

207 The bishops reject the notion of two persons and two natures, the doctrine accepted by Chalcedon, arguing that it is Nestorian, i.e. that it denies the divinity of Christ. Cf. Frend 1972, 213, for Severus’ deployment of comparable arguments.

208 An apparent allusion to a declaration of faith of the emperor (or at least to one forwarded by him); no other trace of it has survived. But the tenor of it, avoiding points of controversy and seeking to formulate a doctrine acceptable to both sides, is in line with the approach taken by the emperor on the third day of negotiations, when he attempted just such a formulation to gain the assent of the anti-Chalcedonian bishops, cf. S section 7 in Brock 1981, 116 with Leppin 2007, 196–7.

209 The bishops, while satisfied with Justinian’s declaration, find that it does not go far enough, since it could be accepted by those who, they felt, were not orthodox; cf. the summary section 5 in Brock 1981, 116, where they insist on specific condemnations of decisions taken at Chalcedon if unity is to be achieved.

210 This is among the first references to the work of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, a late fifth-century or early sixth century work attributed to the Dionysius converted by Saint Paul at Athens (Acts 17.34), an author who enjoyed great popularity subsequently. Cf. vii.12a for another reference. In order to ensure the acceptance of the work as that of a contemporary of Saint Paul, the author avoids controversial christological terminology, but the *De Divinis Nominibus* came to be seen by Severus and his followers as favouring their position: see Grillmeier ii.3, 353–4 and Hainthaler 1997, 284–7. The reference here is to *De div. nom.*

being a non-Christian was guided and attained the primal light of knowledge of God through our master Paul, in the discourse that he made concerning the divine names of the holy Trinity said, “When we consider [the Trinity] as the lover of human beings, we say that it is the lover of humanity, as is appropriate, because it shared perfectly [and] in truth through one of its persons these things that are our own, while drawing to itself and raising the lowliness of our humanity, from which the simple²¹¹ Jesus was indescribably composed, and he who was from beyond eternity and before all times became in the likeness of our nature, and took [upon himself] temporality, without change or confusion,” he who was greater than, [120] and above, all orders and natures. Again, Athanasius, in that discourse concerning the faith, named the union of God the Word with an ensouled flesh a composition, when he said, “What is the ‘conjunction’²¹² so that among those who do not believe [they] say that it is an ‘inhabiting’ instead of ‘embodiment,’ and instead of a union and a composition [they speak of] a human energy?”²¹³

g. Thus, if like our holy fathers [believed], whom Your Tranquillity has followed, God the Word, who was before [the incarnation] simple and not composite, became embodied from the virgin, Birthgiver of God, Mary, and hypostatically united to him an ensouled and intelligible flesh, and made it his own, and it was joined to him in composition in the [divine] economy, then it is evident that we must confess one nature of God the Word who became flesh and became perfectly a human being. Accordingly, God the Word, who beforehand was simple, was not recognised to have become composite in body, if he is again divided after the union, while one says he is in two natures. In this way, just as an ordinary person, who is comprised of different natures – soul, body, and the rest – is not divided into two natures because his soul is joined in composition, but rather he is one nature and [one] human *hypostasis*, so too God the Word, who was united hypostatically and joined in composition with an ensouled flesh, is not divided into or in two natures because of his union and his composition with the body. For according to the word of our fathers, those to whom the fear of God that is in you has cleaved, God the Word, who was formerly simple, wanted

i.4 (113.6–12). Innocentius’ report also notes the allusion to Pseudo-Dionysius (and others) made by the anti-Chalcedonian bishops (ch.22, p.172.3–7); Hypatius, bishop of Ephesus, was sceptical, however, of the genuineness of Pseudo-Dionysius’ work (ch.26, p.173.14–15).

211 Syr. *pešitta*, as opposed to *meħalleṭta*, ‘compound.’

212 Syr. *naqiputa*. After the death of Athanasius, this term would be used by Nestorius and others to describe the connection or joining of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ.

213 A quotation from the pseudo-Athanasian *Quod unus sit christus*, ch.2 (140/98).

to be joined for our sake with ensouled and intelligible flesh, [121] and to become a person without change. Accordingly, the one nature and *hypostasis* of God the Word who became flesh is glorified, as is the one activity that makes known the things of God the Word that are exalted, glorious, and fitting for God, and also the things that are lowly and human. How is it that some persons, who are concerned to reject what Leo wrote in his tome in opposition to these things, he and those of his opinion, are not corrected?’²¹⁴

h. They presented quotations from [Leo] and from Nestorius, Theodore, Diodore, *Theodore and the Council of Chalcedon*, [all of which] declared two natures after *the union* and [after] the embodiment of God the Word, as well as two *hypostaseis*.²¹⁵ They made a copious refutation of these [statements] with proofs drawn from the fathers, who at various times held opinions contrary to these and taught in the church one nature and *hypostasis* of God the Word, who without change became a human being in truth, and was a perfect human being, and remained the very same perfect God, which I omit to write here because of their length and because they can be found everywhere in documents [written] against Dyophysitism.

i. At the end of their petition²¹⁶ they said, ‘On account of this we accept neither the Tome of Leo nor the definition of Chalcedon, O victorious emperor, in keeping the canon and the law of our fathers who assembled in Ephesus and excommunicated and deposed Nestorius, and decided that “We reject and anathematise those who dare to create [122] any other definition of faith other than the one that was set down correctly and in faith by the Holy Spirit at Nicaea.” Those who willfully assembled at Chalcedon nullified and rejected this definition and canon, as they make known in the acts of [Chalcedon].’²¹⁷ They are under punishment and are [judged] guilty

214 The term for ‘activity’ is the Syr. *ma’bedanuta*, a rendering of the Greek *energeia*. On the Severan christology here outlined see (e.g.) Grillmeier ii.2, 156–83/148–73, esp. 172–5/162–6 on the one *energeia* (‘activity’ or ‘operation’) of Christ, cf. Lebon 1951, 553–9, Chesnut 1976, 29–34.

215 The text is here supplemented from Mich. Syr. ix.22 (284b/203). PZ (followed by Mich. Syr.) abbreviates the bishops’ declaration on the grounds that such refutations are commonplace. See Grillmeier ii.1, 71–6/63–8, for a catalogue of anti-Chalcedonian compilations, drawing on the acts of the council and on the writings of the church fathers to refute its decisions. Cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 59, introducing a useful selection of Severus’ dogmatic works, and noting that he had access to the acts of Chalcedon. For Severus and his followers, two natures (*physeis*) was tantamount to two *hypostaseis*, although Chalcedonians sought to preserve the unity of Christ by insisting on one *hypostasis*: see Lebon 1909, 242–53, 276–80, Allen and Hayward 2004, 34.

216 Gk. *deësis*. Cf. n.187 above.

217 An allusion to the justification offered by the bishops assembled at Chalcedon to the

by our holy fathers of having innovated a definition of the faith which is against the true teaching of those who at all times were the pure teachers of the church. These [things] we even now believe: that Your Tranquillity is persuaded with us to help the truth of their faith, while honouring the struggle of their bishops,²¹⁸ through whom the church is exalted and glorified, because now peace reigns in your kingdom through the power of the right hand of God Almighty, whom we supplicate on your behalf, so that without toil or struggle he will place your enemies as a footstool beneath your feet.’²¹⁹

j. When the letter of the defence of the faith written out above had been given to the emperor and was read and many [things] were discussed for the not insignificant [length of] time of one year by the faithful bishops who were assembled there in the royal city at the command of the emperor,²²⁰ as was written above, while joined with them was the learned archimandrite John bar Aphthonia, who recorded these [proceedings],²²¹ the emperor did not ban the Council of Chalcedon from the church.²²² When he summoned by letter the holy Severus, the head of the priests, who was hiding in various places, [Severus] declined to come to him, sending [a letter] to the emperor. Each one of these [123] faithful bishops then went away from Constantinople, to any place [where] he chose to hide himself, as he deemed suitable for him.²²³

Emperor Marcian: they countered potential accusations of innovation by citing the need to keep pace with the evolution of new heresies, *ACO* ii.1.3, pp.110–14 (tr. in Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 111–17).

218 Lit. ‘priests’.

219 Psalm 109(110).1.

220 As Stein 1944, 181, cf.178, notes, basing himself on Cyr. Scyth. *V. Sab.* 72, p.176.9, some talks seem to have taken place already in 531; cf. Stein 1949, 377 n.2. The main talks, here described, probably took place only in March 532, however, so Frend 1972, 264 n.2 (though cf. Menze 2008a, 58 and n.3, who hesitates between 532 and 533). See also Menze 2008a, 188 and n.188, cf. 216, suggesting that the bishops had little choice but to remain in Constantinople: the emperor was seeking to stop the spread of anti-Chalcedonian clergy and ideas.

221 On John bar Aphthonia see PZ viii n.89. He was probably the author of the recently discovered text (H), cf. Brock 1981, 88 and n.188 above.

222 An unlikely contingency in any case. In March 533, however, Justinian issued an edict which supported the theopaschite formula (see glossary) which omitted to mention the council of Chalcedon, thus going some way to satisfy opponents of the council. See Uthemann 1999, 34–7, Leppin 2007, 190, 200–1, Millar 2008, 68–9 (noting an earlier formulation of Justinian already in 527), Menze 2008a, 188–9.

223 John of Tella certainly returned to the frontier region; he was arrested in Persian territory in 537; see PZ viii n.78. Others may have ended up in the Palace of Hormisdas in Constantinople, which became home to a considerable community of anti-Chalcedonians under Theodora’s protection. While on the one hand shielding leading anti-Chalcedonians from persecution, this also represented an attempt, albeit only partially successful, to limit the spread

k. After some time, in [indiction year] thirteen, after many letters from the emperor had reached him, even the holy Severus was received in the palace.²²⁴ He stayed until [the month of] March in [indiction year] fourteen, while the Dyophysite bishops in every place were disturbed, murmuring, and annoyed, especially Ephraem of Antioch, until in their anxiety they informed Agapetus, the head of the priests of Rome, who was of their opinion, and summoned [him] and brought him to the imperial city.²²⁵ How [this came about] and what happened are made known in the chapter that I have written out below. End of the fifteenth chapter concerning the monks²²⁶ who assembled in Constantinople.

a. The sixteenth chapter of the ninth book presents the defence of Severus in a letter, since he declined to come to the royal city, [which] he wrote to the Emperor as follows.²²⁷

‘The Word who is eternally of the Father, the Son of God, he who at last became embodied and did not undergo change, and moreover became a human being perfectly through the Holy Spirit and the holy virgin Mary the Birthgiver of God, and [who] truly resembled us in everything except

of their doctrines and the ordination of an alternative clergy. See Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 86–91, Bardill 2000, 1–11, esp. 5–6, Croke 2006 (arguing persuasively that it was not until after 536 that the number of anti-Chalcedonians in Constantinople swelled), Hatlie 2007, 143–50, Leppin 2007, 197, Menze 2008a, 187, 221–6, with Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 676–84.

224 PZ narrates the arrival of Severus in Constantinople more fully at ix.19, where he states that Theodora, who held him in the highest regard, was instrumental in persuading Justinian to summon him, cf. Evagr. iv.10 with Foss 2002, 143–4 (the standard view); Menze 2008a, 227–8, is sceptical, however, of the genuineness of Theodora’s anti-Chalcedonian credentials. At ix.15 and 16 PZ places Severus’ departure for Constantinople in indiction 13, i.e. 534/5, while at ix.19 he dates his arrival in the city to indiction 14, i.e. 535/6. Some therefore place his arrival already in late 534 or early 535 (so Frend 1972, 269, accepted by Grillmeier ii.2, 364/347–8, Allen and Hayward 2004, 29, Millar 2008, 70), others not until September 535 (the first month of indiction 14, so Stein 1944, 181–2). Stein’s arguments should be preferred (see further n.289, cf. Menze 2008a, 190 and n.196).

225 Severus left the city in March 536. Fortescue in Maspero 1923, 121 n.4, suggests that Severus rather went into hiding in March, but only left Constantinople after he was condemned by Justinian’s law of August 536 (*Nov.* 42). See PZ ix.19c below on the summoning of Agapetus to Constantinople.

226 The reference to monks must be in error for bishops, as stated in the chapter heading, although of course many had started their career – like Severus – as monks.

227 PZ here reproduces Severus’ defence of his christology (CPG 7070[4]), a document that again does not survive elsewhere. For an analysis of the views here defended see the works mentioned in n.204 above. A new translation of most of this chapter, by Hayward, is given in Allen and Hayward 2004, 153–8, cf. Kugener 1904, 281–5 (text and translation).

sin, through handing down the teaching of salvation through parables to his disciples [planted] the seed that was in it,²²⁸ so that both they and all who are in the world, receiving through them the word concerning everything, might ascribe anything good that might spring up from it through righteousness [124] and in pious deeds as from grace, not to them[selves] but rather to the power of the one who in the beginning sowed, and making acclamations they might cry out with loud and strong voices in the valleys, caves, and crags in the wilderness. Likewise, your serene might has sown the seed of philanthropy in my vileness, and has caused this letter to spring up from me, [though] not as a child of impudence. For how is it possible that the mighty and strong voice of Your Majesty could be heard by me but no reply should be given from me? For when they who bitterly despised my paucity thought they had shut the doors in my face in every place without mercy, then indeed as though by an unexpected miracle, through your letter you called me to you, [I being] a man who is like one pursued and banished by the opposition. This very thing is like God, who to those who were pursued by enemies and who thought that they were shut in and captured by them, provided a broad way of salvation, that was worthy of his wisdom and his great strength. This is the miracle he performed [against] Pharaoh, he who let them [go] after a long period of subjugation, [but] again pursued them to bring them into the subjugation of his hard yoke, and with his horses surrounded them in the wilderness of the Red Sea and closed off the way as though saying in his mind, "They have got lost in the land, for the wilderness has shut them in."²²⁹ Yet the miraculous God, [125] who commanded Moses to raise his staff over the sea in order that it be divided, made a dry road of grace [over] the sea for those who thought that they were closed in by warriors, so that they could pass over it on foot. So in close resemblance to those [events] you have divided with Your Majesty's staff of peace the sea of the wilderness that seized me, and you have again made the way that was thought to be impassable such that it became passable for me.

228 Or, following HB 254 '... fulfilling the teaching of salvation in parables, [sowed] the seed from it in his disciples ...'

229 Exodus 14.3. The deposed patriarch may be alluding to the problems besetting him in Egypt, where the followers of Julian were gaining the upper hand. In such a context, the emperor's invitation for talks was a welcome indication of his pre-eminence. Cf. Frend 1972, 262–3, Maraval 1998c, 401–5, on the strength of support for Julian and his doctrines in Egypt at this time: his disciple Gaianus was able to oust the elected patriarch Theodosius from his see in February 535 and to take his place for 103 days before imperial troops restored Theodosius. Mich. Syr. ix.21 (278–9/193–4c) and Lib. *Brev.* 20/142–4 give the details, cf. Brooks 1903, 497, Maspero 1923, 110–19, 347, Demicheli 1983, 229, Allen and Hayward 2004, 28, Dijkstra 2008, 297.

b. And the great proof of your gentleness is that you wrote without reluctance your letter [addressed] to me with oaths, promising me no harm. In this is a sign of God, because he also while condescending to human weakness many times sent his promises with oaths, as the book teaches, and Paul mentioned it, saying, “When God counselled Abraham, because he did not have anything that was greater than him[self] to swear on, he swore on himself, saying, ‘I shall indeed bless you and I shall indeed multiply you.’”²³⁰ I, a vile [person], dare to say that I was in no need of safety such as this, for I was certain only from the word that goes out from your mouth, which is a perfect guardian for me. Just as the wise Qohelet said, “Keep the commandment of the king, and be not anxious because of the word of the oaths of God.”²³¹ I have confidence in the proof from those deeds that witness in truth more than oaths [to] your peacefulness as well as [to] your inclination to mercy for those who are gentle in soul. For as soon as you received the responsibilities²³² of the empire, you released all the classes [of society] sentenced to exile from sorrow: the heads of the priests, the nobles, and the commoners, while having regard for that which is equally honoured by [each] person: the shining of [God’s] sun, [126] the rain, the temperate air that he brings, and the rest that is required for and is conducive to the life of human beings.²³³

c. Yet I will not, through drinking from the abundance of this rich stream of your gentleness, cause myself to err, and be carried away. Rather, I have decided in my mind to make these [things] known. For I tremble lest while in the imperial city my inferiority be seen openly and many might be alarmed. While in truth I am nothing but a vile [person] who is bound in this heavy yoke of sins, when they hear this, many will become angry and will be inflamed from this trivial anxiety as though from a little coal of fire, so as to trouble and annoy even Your Majesty, because of your love towards me, and I think that it will seem unworthy of you and not profitable to others.²³⁴ This I say, not as though I can prevail against the dominion of your empire, for it

230 Hebrews 6.13–14.

231 Ecclesiastes 8.2. Qohelet, ‘the one who assembles’, is translated into Greek as Ecclesiastes. The first words are literally ‘Keep the mouth of the king ...’

232 Lit. ‘anxieties, worries.’

233 Severus alludes to the détente practised by Justinian, at least from c.531, in allowing the return of the anti-Chalcedonians to their monasteries in the East, as PZ mentions at viii.5c, cf. n.188 above. See also Leppin 2006 on Justinian’s openness to dialogue, at least in this opening phase of his reign.

234 Severus accurately foresaw the consequences of his presence in Constantinople: when he was there in 535–6, his success in gaining allies among the patriarchs, in particular Anthimus of Constantinople, led to a backlash; see further below on ix.19.

is written, “Whenever a righteous king sits upon a throne, all that is evil does not rise up against his eyes,”²³⁵ but because I am persuaded that, on account of this power that is attached to you through the grace that is from on high, you are clad in understanding and wisdom, and you strive to do many things not by the sword but rather by the sagacity that befits kingship. We are instructed about this from Scripture, which says, “A wise king winnows and scatters the wicked.”²³⁶ Just as it is easy for one to separate from the wheat those who are winnowed by the wind which blows away the chaff, so also is it simple for Your Serenity, my lord, with an all-contemplating heart and with the mercy of a gracious father, [127] to separate from all who are subservient to you those who are against [you], so that the churches in union may be counted worthy of friendship. For I know that for this reason you also decided that my weakness should be summoned to come to your feet, because you also called the pious bishops of the East, those who pray for the salvation and the protection of your empire. While you have made [my weakness] worthy of your letter, they too, when they had written to you whatever appeared [right] to them, informed my weakness [of] your will, urging us, according to the custom of the church, to help you through prayer on your behalf.²³⁷

d. In Alexandria, your great city, I have done none of those slanderous things that are said about me, and it is easy for me to demonstrate the folly of those informants. For they slandered me, saying that I stirred up a seditious conflict by means of a large [sum] of gold that I distributed in [the city], but it is known to all those who hate me greatly, that, though I am entangled in the sufferings of other sins, I do not seek to collect money quickly, and [certainly] not for trivial reasons; rather my life is so habitually poor that not even the renowned diocese [of Antioch] set me free from [poverty].²³⁸ For as is the custom that we should serve as priests with the intention of

235 Proverbs 20.8.

236 Proverbs 20.26.

237 Severus makes clear that he remains in contact with the bishops of the eastern provinces, as is in any case clear from his correspondence, *Coll. ep.* 35, *PO* 12 (1915), 279–90. Cf. Menze 2008a, 150–1, on his close contacts with the bishops who went to Constantinople in 532.

238 Severus alludes to the tense situation in Egypt. At the end of the chapter PZ alludes to Severus remaining in Egypt until 534/5, implying that the letter must have been sent before then, presumably in 532 or 533, around the time of the negotiations in Constantinople, on which see n.188 above. The accusations are somewhat implausible, given that Severus’ asceticism was well known: see (e.g.) Allen and Hayward 2004, 14–15, 18 (citing John bar Aphthonia, *Vit. Sev.*, *PO* 2 [1903], 243).

being poor [as] is suitable for priests,²³⁹ so also for this [reason] the law was given through Moses to the chosen tribe of Levi, commanding that it should have no inheritance in the land, that the offering of alms be sufficient for its well-being, partaking through these [things] with the widows, the needy, and the orphans because they are accustomed to poverty. [Moses] said, “And the Levite will come, who has no portion or inheritance with you, and the stranger, the orphan, and the widow who are in your villages, and they will eat and rejoice, and the Lord your God will bless you in all the deeds that you [128] do.”²⁴⁰ Since, as it is written, “Righteous lips are acceptable to the king, and he loves upright speech,”²⁴¹ Your Majesty may learn from the officials who were in Alexandria at that time, and now from their successors whom nothing escapes, whether anything like this has been done by me, even in word, or [whether anything] has been reported as [those] who lie against me and slander me [claim]. Concerning them, those informants, I will say nothing, because it does not escape your knowledge [as to] what [sort of men] these are, but I await with them the judgment, after we have been separated from this world of toil, before the dais of Christ, to which we will give a reply for the idle word and for the vain thought, and especially shall we bishops be judged, to whom much has been entrusted,²⁴² although here we delight in bodily [things] and relax.

e. If some call “a provocation” what I wrote to Julian, the bishop of Halicarnassus, who converted to the heresy of the Manichaeans, and [who] considers the willing sufferings of the salvation of the Messiah, the great God, [to be] a fantasy, with ten thousand mouths and tongues I confess and I do not renounce these [things] that I have written, just as no one can command me suddenly to renounce my faith.²⁴³ For this is seen in your faith also, [you] who care to hold fast to the things of the spirit more than to affairs of the world. I did not do these [things] while being hasty in my will or in my soul, but rather I was very much forced by him to write, because he thought that I agreed with his teaching. For when I went through these [things] that he sent to me, being far from Alexandria, in the things that he had written I found that in the word “incorruptibility,” as though with the skin [129] of

239 Cf. Deuteronomy 18.1.

240 Deuteronomy 14.29.

241 Proverbs 16.13.

242 Cf. Matthew 25.29.

243 Severus offers a blistering attack on Julian's views, and in particular on Julian's notion of the incorruptibility of Christ, on which see above ix.9–13, with which cf. *Coll. ep.* 35, *PO* 12 (1915), 286–7. He alludes to his exchange with the bishop, summarised by PZ at ix.10–13 above.

a sheep, he was concealing the blasphemies of Mani; because they are [so] many I refrain from mentioning [them].

f. This foolish man, who confesses the sufferings [of the Messiah] only with his lips to hide his impiety wrote, “Incorruptibility was always associated with the body of our Lord, which was passible voluntarily for the sake of others.”²⁴⁴ In fraternal love I wrote and asked him, “What is it that you were saying [by] ‘incorruptible’ and ‘suffered voluntarily for the sake of others’ and ‘was associated with the body of our Lord,’ if without falsehood you confess [that he was] passible by nature? For if you were saying ‘holiness that was without sin’ [when you said] he had incorruptibility, all of us confess this with you, that the holy body from the womb which he united to himself originally by the Holy Spirit, from the pure virgin Birthgiver of God, was conceived and was born in the flesh without sin and went about with us human beings, because “He did not commit any sin, neither was deceit found in his mouth,”²⁴⁵ according to the witness of Scripture. But if you call ‘incorruptible’ ‘not passible’ and ‘immortal,’ and are saying that it was not with voluntary suffering that the body that suffered for us in the flesh was capable of suffering and dying in the flesh, then you reduce the saving passions on our behalf to a fantasy, for anything that does not suffer also does not die, and is incapable of suffering.”²⁴⁶ When he received remarks such as these from me, he openly refused to say the holy body of Emmanuel was passible with voluntary sufferings, and thus he did not hesitate to write to us openly and without shame, “We do not say ‘consubstantial with us in sufferings’ but rather ‘in essence.’ Therefore, even if he is impassible, and if he is incorruptible, he is consubstantial with us in nature.”²⁴⁷ [130] Now

244 Jul. Halic. frg.16, to be found in Sev., *Critique du Tome de Julien* in *Pol.*, i, 124.27–125.7/96–7, ‘We have for this reason copious demonstrations confirming through examination, and not from reason, these things that are beyond reason. For if someone believes that the bush, like the body, was kindled but did not burn, while fire sprang up from the wood, then just as he does not believe that while the body of our Lord was suffering willingly for others, there was ever found in it incorruptibility, then also he should not believe concerning the bush, that it was possessed of a flame without at the same time being burned.’

245 1 Peter 2.22.

246 Cf. Sev. *ep.*3 in Sev. *Pol.*, i, 253–4/195–6.

247 Jul. Halic. frg. 52, quoted several times by Severus, most fully in *Contra Additionem Juliani* in *Pol.* iiA, ch.26 (81/68), cf. Draguet 1924, 206 n.4 on the translation of *pathêtikon*. Draguet 1924, 19*–20*, has ‘For you have dared to utter openly in your despised book an addition to creation, new clods of clay: “We do not say ‘he is the same nature as us’ according to that which has the ability to suffer, [but] rather according to that which is of the same essence: just as he is without suffering, we would be without corruption. He is not the same nature as us according to that which is of the very same nature [other MSS: ‘essence’]; for because he

I omit to write the rest of the nonsense of Julian's error, which, contained in its full length, is found in the many writings against Julian that this holy Severus made.²⁴⁸

g. Finally, he wrote in the letter, saying, 'As I supplicate and seize your feet while again repeating [my] word, may you excuse my deficiency, and may you not bring me forth publicly again, I who have become enfeebled in my body and in my mind, wherefore I am also weak because the word of Scripture is true that says, "The soul falls with a thrust."²⁴⁹ There are now on my head many white hairs that bear witness to me concerning death and departure from this tiresome life, and it seems to me very good and profitable to sit hidden in a corner and bear in my mind the separation of the soul from the body, awaiting my grave, for "the earth is the home of everyone who dies," as Job said.²⁵⁰ Though for the rest of the animals who live on the earth their hair does not change, this rational animal, the human being, because he was destined to come to judgment and for his deeds to be examined in the future world, when he arrives at old age, the hair on his head becomes white, which proclaims to him and incites [him] in such a manner, for the sake of those who have delayed, to prepare his deeds for his departure. Scripture also testifies to him, "Lift up your eyes and look at the fields that have become white and prepared for the harvest,"²⁵¹ for the separation of the soul from the body is in truth a harvest, and as though with a sickle he cuts it away from [the body], and it is emptied. So I beg that Your Majesty will grant this [request], because it is simpler for me [**131**] to dwell hidden where I am, in order to live the rest of my days in the world secretly as though in a corner, for such is the life of a monk.

h. May Christ God give you dominion over all your enemies, and may you be crowned also with the perfect peace and harmony of the churches. If I am committing any fault or presumption in this my letter of petition, I entreat that you forgive me like the rest, for it is very appropriate for a Christ-loving emperor to overcome evil with good, as the apostle said, "It is right for a Christ-loving king to conquer evil with good."²⁵² The signature

suffered willingly, whereas we do not suffer these things willingly, then in this respect he was different in essence."

248 PZ's own intervention, justifying the omission of part of the letter, cf. Allen and Hayward 2004, 184 n.23.

249 Or possibly read 'with beatings,' PZV ii, 89 n.4; see PZV i, 52 n.2. The source of this citation is unidentified.

250 Job 30.23.

251 John 4.35.

252 Romans 12.21. Cf. the loyal declarations of the bishops, ix.15b above.

of Severus to this letter: ‘May the only Trinity, for that is our God, preserve Your Fidelity for many years, while you bring peace to the dominion of the state of the Romans, and may he subjugate to you every people of the Romans and of the barbarians, and give through you perfect harmony in the sound faith to the holy churches, and may he make you worthy of crowns in the kingdom of heaven.’ After this letter the holy Severus remained [where he was] until [indiction year] thirteen, and then he arrived in the royal city, because the letters of the emperor pressured him.

a. The seventeenth chapter is about Africa, which was conquered by the general Belisarius.²⁵³

In the summer of [indiction year] eleven, when peace [was made] in Roman territory with the Persians through Rufinus and Hermogenes the *magister (officiorum)* with the help of our Lord according to the [terms] contained in a written [treaty], and the generals and the army of the Romans that were in the East arrived in the royal city, they received [132] from the emperor blame and condemnations because he had elevated and exalted them, but they had not shown themselves [to be] brave and astute in the struggle with the Persians, especially Belisarius, since the army that was with him had been lost, having been defeated in the battle at Tannuris and on the Euphrates. [Belisarius] made his defence to the emperor on [the grounds of] the impatience of the army and the lack of discipline among the men who were with him.²⁵⁴

b. There were some notables from Africa in Constantinople, who, because of a dispute that they had with the local prince, had departed from their region, and took refuge with the emperor and informed him concerning the region,²⁵⁵ [saying] that it was very expansive and very peaceful, and that

253 The recapture of North Africa in 533 is narrated in detail by Proc. (*Wars* iii.1–iv.7), who accompanied Belisarius on the expedition. Modern accounts may be found in Pringle 1981, 16–22, Evans 1996, 126–36, Moorhead 1994, 65–9, Cameron 2000b, 559–60.

254 On the Eternal Peace of 532/3 see ix.7. See Greatrex 1998, 194–5, on the commission that enquired into Belisarius’ defeat at Callinicum. Belisarius’ defence is borne out by PZ’s and Proc.’s descriptions of the battle (on which see PZ ix.6 above, cf. Greatrex 1998, 200–1).

255 PZ’s information here is unique. On refugees from the West in Constantinople generally see Moorhead 1992, 170, noting that many North Africans were to be found there by the end of the fifth century. We cannot identify these magnates. They could have left during the persecutions of the late fifth century or following the seizure of power by Gelimer in 530: until this point, relations between the Vandal king Hilderic and Justinian had been extremely cordial. Proc. *Wars* iii.20.4–6 refers to merchants imprisoned by Gelimer at Carthage, cf. Modéran 2003a, 583, on links between Constantinople and North Africa. According to Proc. *Wars* iii.10.1–17, most of Justinian’s advisers opposed the idea of intervening in the region,

it was not considering war with the Romans but was engaged in a struggle with the Moors,²⁵⁶ a people dwelling in the desert, living from robbery and destruction like the Ṭayyayê.²⁵⁷ They demonstrated to the emperor that this land was torn and snatched away from the Romans in the days of Zrzyrkws, who had besieged Rome and also had carried off valuable vessels of gold and silver and other precious [things] and departed to Carthage in Africa, the distinguished city, which he besieged, captured, and in which he resided,²⁵⁸ storing his treasures there.²⁵⁹

c. Then the Emperor prepared an army with Belisarius, Martin, and Archelaus the *hyparchus*, and many ships carrying arms and materiel²⁶⁰ for the army,²⁶¹ and they travelled over the sea, and because God willed this and gave assistance, they arrived in a few days and suddenly appeared before the royal city of Carthage.²⁶² The local prince was not there, but was engaged

recalling previous fiascos, and John the Cappadocian was particularly outspoken; an eastern bishop, however, convinced the emperor to go ahead, declaring that he had been assured by a dream that God was with him (10.18–21). See Stein 1949, 311–18, Moorhead 1994, 65–6, Evans 1996, 126–7 on the background to the Roman attack.

256 Syr. *mareṭinê*.

257 Gelimer was indeed taken by surprise by the Roman invasion: his brother Tzazon was absent at the time with the Vandal fleet and 5000 men, subduing a revolt in Sardinia: see Proc. Wars iii.11.23 with Evans 1996, 127. North Africa remained a prosperous region, as PZ states, although he seriously underestimates the importance of the Berbers (Moors), who had inflicted serious defeats on the Vandals. See Modéran 2003a, 573–8, noting that PZ's analogy of Berbers and Saracens probably reflected the attitude of the eastern command, however erroneous it was, cf. Evans 1996, 82–3, Cameron 2000b, 556–9, Moorhead 2001, 51–4, 56–8 and in general *AnTard* 10–11 (2002–3), dedicated to late antique North Africa.

258 The following word, Syr. *'as'en*, means 'he shod.' This cannot be correct. No attempt has been made to translate it.

259 The Vandals had crossed to North Africa from Spain in 429 and occupied Carthage in 440. Geiseric, the first Vandal king (428–77, *PLRE* ii, Geisericus, PZ's Zrzyrkws), captured Rome in 455 and took back much booty to Carthage, including (e.g.) the treasures that Titus and Vespasian had seized from Jerusalem in A.D. 70. See Proc. Wars iii.3–5, Raven 1993, 194–200, Cameron 2000, 553–4, Moorhead 2001, 50–1.

260 The Syriac word *neḥata*, 'outer garments,' seems implausible in this context.

261 Belisarius commanded the expedition as *magister militum per Orientem*. Archelaus was the praetorian prefect (*PLRE* iii, Archelaus 5 with Meier 2003a, 179 n.378). Martin (*PLRE* iii, Martinus 2) was one of several officers commanding units in the army, which numbered 10,000 infantry and 8000 cavalry; 500 transport ships conveyed the army across the Mediterranean, escorted by 92 warships. For details see Proc. Wars iii.11.1–21 with Pringle 1981, 16–17, Evans 1996, 127.

262 According to Proc. Wars iii.15.31, it took just three months for the expeditionary force to reach Caput Vada, 200 km south of Carthage, where they landed in late August 533. See Pringle 1981, 18, Evans 1996, 128.

in a war in the desert with the Berbers. A small force which was in the city came out and met the Romans and was defeated [133] in battle and, being vanquished, it retreated. The city was surrendered and the Romans entered [it] and occupied it.²⁶³ They collected the prince's spoil, and the treasure was kept for the emperor of the Romans.²⁶⁴ The Romans occupied some of the cities of the region because they were betrayed to them by certain men who were with them [and] who held the country in contempt.²⁶⁵ They knew that it is an extensive territory, extending over some fifty days' journey,²⁶⁶ containing more than 130 cities, and is rich and fertile.²⁶⁷ The king, the head of the priests who was there, and the notables of the people were Ariminians.²⁶⁸ When the prince heard and arrived with the army, they were

263 Proc. does not refer to a war against the Berbers at this point: in fact, Gelimer was at his royal estate at Hermione in Byzacium, *Wars* iii.14.10. The first battle here mentioned must be that at Ad Decimum, just outside Carthage, on 13 September 533, on which see Proc. *Wars* iii.18–19 with Pringle 1981, 18–20, Evans 1996, 129: the Vandals were heavily defeated, having attacked Belisarius' army piece-meal. Belisarius was therefore able to occupy Carthage immediately.

264 Cf. n.259 above on the spoils accumulated by Geiseric in Carthage with Proc. *Wars* iv.3.24–7 on the riches seized by the Romans after the victory at Tricamerum (see below). Belisarius took them with him to Constantinople in spring 534, cf. Proc. *Wars* iv.9.1–8.

265 PZ passes over the detail of the Roman annexation of the north African provinces; his reference to the betrayal of cities looks like a supposition, based on the situation on the eastern frontier, although it is true that just after the Roman landing, the city of Syllectus handed over its keys to the invaders, Proc. *Wars* iii.16.10–11. In fact, Geiseric had slighted the cities (Proc. *Wars* iii.5.8), and therefore the Romans had little difficulty in seizing control of them (cf. Proc. *Wars* iv.5.1–10). They then embarked upon an extensive programme of reconstructing the defences, as a large epigraphic dossier testifies: see Raven 1993, 214–16, Pringle 1981, 89–120, Durliat 1981, 93–114.

266 Cf. Proc. *Wars* iii.10.14, where John the Cappadocian estimates the distance to Carthage by land at 140 days' march. As the crow flies, it is about 1200 km from Carthage to Tingis.

267 See n.257 above on the prosperity of North Africa; with PZ's statement cf. Vict. Vit. *Hist. Pers.* i.3 (3/3), cited by Lepelley 1979, 33, and Quodvultdeus, *De temp. barb.* ii.5.4 (476.14–477.1). The figures of 130 cities is certainly not an exaggeration, cf. Lepelley 1979, 47–9, noting that one survey gives a figure of 150 cities in northern Byzacena alone; Evagr. iv.18 refers to Justinian restoring 150 cities in Africa. Council records, which report the presence of bishops from cities in the north African provinces, confirm this impression: while a council at Carthage in 525 was attended by only 61 bishops, nine years later 220 participated. See Courtois 1955, 305–8 with Raven 1993, 100–21, Cameron 2000b, 555; also Leone 2007, 187–98, on the evolution of cities after the imperial reconquest.

268 PZ rightly notes the adherence of the Vandals to Arianism; the allusion is to the council of Ariminum (359), although Krüger 1901, 284 (cf. AK 206), interprets it rather as a rendering of the Greek *Areiomanitai*, i.e. mad Arians. In the late fifth century there had been serious persecutions of the orthodox in the kingdom, but the situation had improved under Gelimer's predecessor Hilderic. See Evans 1996, 82, Moorhead 2001, 54–6, Modéran 1998, 252–71,

seen to be small and contemptible against the Romans, and when he understood that his relatives had been taken, that his magnates had surrendered, and that his treasure had been taken away, he softened, and on the condition that his life be spared, he surrendered.²⁶⁹ He was taken away with Belisarius in [indiction year] twelve, and was publicly presented with the treasure, his relatives, and his magnates to the emperor in the circus before the people.²⁷⁰ An ambassador of Khusro, king of the Persians, who was present there and in attendance witnessed these [events].²⁷¹ Since then, Africa was subjugated to the Romans, and one after the other the rest of the cities in the countryside of Africa were conquered; only the Berbers, as is [their] custom, are hostile there.²⁷²

a. The eighteenth chapter of the ninth discourse is about Rome, which was conquered by Belisarius.

Theodoric, a tyrant in the days of Zeno and Anastasius, captured [134] Rome in a rebellion. He was a warlike and capable man, and he very much stabilised the territory of Italy.²⁷³ He built Rome and kept the barbarians

idem 2003b. As soon as the provinces had been reconquered, the orthodox sought to regain control of all their lands and churches, demands which led to some unrest because of Arian elements in the Roman army and marriage alliances between soldiers and Vandal women: see Kaegi 1965, Cameron 1989, 177–8, Greatrex 2001a.

269 A reference to the Roman victory at Tricamerum, just outside Carthage, in December 533, on which see Proc. *Wars* iv.1–4 with Pringle 1981, 21–2, Evans 1996, 130–1. Gelimer fled from the battle and sought refuge in the mountains to the south; after exchanging letters with Belisarius and receiving assurances that his life would be spared, he agreed to surrender, cf. Proc. *Wars* iv.7.12.

270 Belisarius returned to Constantinople in early 534, partly in order to quash rumours that claimed he intended to rebel against the emperor. Proc. *Wars* iv.9.1–12 provides a detailed description of the triumph held by Justinian in the city to commemorate the victory, which confirms the account of PZ here; cf. Mal. 18.81. See McCormick 1986, 125–9, Evans 1996, 132–3, and Meier 2003a, 150–65.

271 This detail receives partial confirmation from Proc. *Wars* i.26.2–3, where he reports that Khusro was vexed at Justinian's success and asked the emperor for a share of the spoils through an envoy.

272 The struggle against the Berber tribesmen was a long and arduous one, on which see Pringle 1981, 27–39, Raven 1993, 213–20, Evans 1996, 133–6, 169–71, Cameron 2000b, 560–1, Modéran 2003a, 585–644.

273 Theodoric here, as in PZ vii.12d, is rendered in Syriac as Alimeric. On the form of Theodoric's name see PZ vii n.211. It is interesting that he is here called tyrant (cf. vi.6e), not Anticaesar (as at vii.12d and elsewhere), which may be a reflection of PZ's source, perhaps the Dominic mentioned below (so Prostko-Prostyński 1993, 20, cf. Goltz 2009, 193).

Theodoric the Amal had posed a serious challenge to imperial authority in the Balkans before the Emperor Zeno persuaded him to leave the area and install his people in Italy. Accordingly in

[away] from it.²⁷⁴ He died, and those after him, one after the other, held and governed the territory of the Romans, rebelling against the empire of Constantinople.²⁷⁵ A certain Dominic,²⁷⁶ who was one of the leaders of the region, was in a dispute with the tyrant, and he took refuge with the Emperor Justinian and informed him concerning the province. [Dominic] was an expert²⁷⁷ in the reading of the Scriptures [and] a Dyophysite. He engaged in much debate, and I know him.²⁷⁸ When the emperor had conquered Africa in

late 488 Theoderic and the Goths set off for Italy, which they reached the following year. There he defeated Odoacer, the barbarian leader who had ruled there since the deposition of the last western emperor, Romulus Augustulus, in 493 and seized his capital at Ravenna. At least at this point, Theoderic, far from being a rebel, was acting on the emperor's behalf. See Heather 1991, 364–8, Moorhead 1992, 17–19, Ausbüttel 2003, 52–5. Relations with the East worsened under Anastasius, however: see Moorhead 1992, 174–5, 184–8, Ausbüttel 2003, 120–1. The constitutional position of Theoderic is a much contested issue; Proc. *Wars* v.1.26–31 offers a very favourable assessment of his rule, opining that although he was a tyrant (*tyrannos*) he ruled in the manner of an emperor (*basileus*) (1.29). He appears to have made no claim to be emperor, preferring the title of *rex*. For full discussion see Moorhead 1992, 39–51, Prostko-Prostyński 1993, Kohlhas-Müller 1995, 11–202, Ausbüttel 2003, 68–77.

274 Whether Theoderic strengthened Italy itself may be doubted, although he was portrayed as a victor over foreign peoples and built up a important network of alliances. See Evans 1996, 84–5, Heather 1996, 230–5, Ausbüttel 2003, 111–15, Mitchell 2007, 215–21. On Theoderic's building activities see PZ vii n.212.

275 Theoderic died in 526, leaving a reputation tarnished by the execution of several high-ranking Romans at his court, among them the philosopher Boethius. See Moorhead 1992, 212–48, Evans 1996, 84, Ausbüttel 2003, 129–48. Since his son Eutharic had predeceased him, his grandson Athalaric inherited the throne. While he remained yet a child, his mother Amalasuintha took over as regent. Upon the death of Athalaric in October 534, her position was compromised, and in order to maintain her power she married Theodahad, Theoderic's nephew. He quickly sidelined his wife, imprisoning and then executing her in April 535. For details see Proc. *Wars* v.4–6, Stein 1949, 328–39, Wolfram 1988, 332–42, Moorhead 1994, 72–7, Evans 1996, 136–8. At no point (cf. PZ vii n.212) does PZ show any awareness that Theoderic or his successors were Gothic leaders (rather than insubordinate Romans).

276 Or 'Demonicus'.

277 Syr. *saba*, lit. 'old man.'

278 *PLRE* iii, Domnicus 1, cf. Moorhead 1992, 171, noting other evidence for Italian malcontents in Constantinople. *PLRE* argues that it is unlikely that PZ's Dominic/Domnicus can be identified with Flavius Domnicus 3, who took part in campaigns in Africa in the late 530s before twice visiting Italy in 540 on missions for Justinian. In fact, there is much to be said for the identification: Flavius Domnicus was involved in doctrinal negotiations with pope Vigilius, and even appended his signature to a letter, indicating his support for the decisions of the synod of Constantinople of 536 against Severus and his followers, cf. *PCBE* ii, Domnicos. As *PLRE* iii, Domnicus 1, suggests, he may well have defected to Justinian in late 534, at the time of the embassy of Liberius (who also defected) and Opilio, cf. Proc. *Wars* v.4.15 with Evans 1996, 138. See also Goltz 2009, 193 n.88.

the manner written above, he was eager to conquer Rome also.²⁷⁹ [Justinian], considering that Belisarius had been successful in the war in Africa while not injuring the population there or diminishing it through bloodshed,²⁸⁰ had been content with the [things] that are [typically] asked for, [namely] tribute, taxes, and subjection, [then] prepared an army and sent it to Rome. John, the head of the priests of [Rome], had died in those days, and after him Agapetus became [bishop].²⁸¹ When the army reached Naples, the famous city that is not a great distance from Rome and captured it,²⁸² the Senate that was in Rome and their council, together with their leaders,²⁸³ became anxious and were afraid, because they had earlier learned about Carthage and after that the tyrant who was there had been defeated. When they had considered these things, they sent beforehand a petition, asked for peace, and promised to surrender the city, and following this [letter] they sent hostages.²⁸⁴ Afterwards, when Belisarius with his army arrived there, he was received in the city with the praises of its inhabitants, and he took it but did no damage to it.²⁸⁵ He remained there for a time while also taking the rest of the cities and subjugated [them] to the emperor, without committing any murderous injury [135] or destruction of the population.²⁸⁶ The emperor became famous for

279 Cf. Just. Nov. 30.11.2 (April 536), quoted by Moorhead 2001, 133 (but misdated) on Justinian's eagerness, following the conquest of North Africa, to extend his conquests further. See Moorhead 1994, 75–6, on other indications of imperial interest in the peninsula in the early 530s.

280 Such was Belisarius' intention (see the speech attributed to him by Proc. Wars iii.16.2–8), although other commanders in the province, such as Sergius, the nephew of Solomon, proved less upright and competent. See (e.g.) Stein 1949, 547–60, Evans 1996, 169–70, Cameron 2000b, 560.

281 Pope John II reigned from 2 January 533 to 8 May 535; Agapitus succeeded him on 13 May. See Stein 1949, 342.

282 Proc. narrates the capture of Naples in late summer 536 at Wars v.8–10; his troops took the city by climbing through an aqueduct. See Stein 1949, 346, Evans 1996, 139–40.

283 Reading for sg. 'leader; or 'prince', following PZV ii, 92 n.6.

284 PZ refers to the senate (using the Gk *synklêtos*), then refers also the council (*boulê*), another term often used for the senate itself: clearly he (or his source) is confused as to the government of Italy at this time. The Gothic ruler at the time was Theodahad, who had signally failed to do anything to oppose Belisarius' march northwards. The Goths therefore replaced him with Vitigis, who swiftly executed his predecessor; see Proc. Wars v.11.1–9. When he in turn left only a small garrison to defend Rome, the new pope Silverius entered into contact with Belisarius and invited the imperial army in, see Proc. Wars v.11.26, 14.4–5, Evans 1996, 140.

285 Belisarius occupied the city on 9 or 10 December 536: see Moorhead 1994, 80 with n.16 (noting some doubts about the month). He immediately made preparations for a siege, Proc. Wars v.14.14–16, to the considerable unease of the population.

286 PZ gives the impression that the conquest of the rest of the peninsula went smoothly. In

these [events]²⁸⁷ and rejoiced in [indiction year] fourteen.²⁸⁸

a. The nineteenth chapter is concerning Severus, who again went up to Constantinople and appeared before the emperor.

The renowned Severus, having been summoned urgently by the emperor, finally reached Constantinople in [indiction year] fourteen²⁸⁹ and was received lovingly in the palace by the emperor, whom the empress Theodora had prepared and predisposed, because she was seized with love for Severus and he was honoured and venerable in her eyes.²⁹⁰ Then Epiphanius, the chief of the priests of the place, died, and Anthimus became [bishop] after him. He was an ascetic man, one practising poverty, a lover of the poor, and faithful. He was the bishop of Trebizond, and he happened for [some] reason to be [in Constantinople]. He excelled in his way of life and was known to the emperor and the magnates because of his chastity. He was appointed patriarch, but he did not accept the Council of Chalcedon into the faith.²⁹¹

fact, it was not until 540 that it all came under Roman control, and Rome itself had to endure a siege from February 537 to March 538: for details see *Proc. Wars* v.17–vi.30 with Stein 1949, 339–68, Evans 1996, 140–50.

287 Or 'was informed of these [things],' but this reading is not as likely: see PZV ii, 92 n.7.

288 PZ's dating here is uncertain: neither indiction 13 (534/5) nor indiction 14 (535/6) is satisfactory, since by 1 September 536, the start of indiction 15, Rome was not yet in imperial hands (see above). The receipt of the keys of Rome, sent to Justinian by Belisarius (*Proc. Wars* v.14.15) would be a suitable moment for rejoicing, but he cannot have received them before January 537.

289 On the date of Severus' arrival in Constantinople see n.224 above. The capital had already been attracting notable anti-Chalcedonians since the talks of 532, cf. n.188 above. Around the time of Severus' arrival there also appeared there Ze'ura, a former stylite and vigorous opponent of the council; although Justinian ended up condemning all of these figures (including also Peter of Apamea) in 536 (*Nov.* 42, see below), there is no reason to suppose that Severus came with Ze'ura. See Leppin 2007, 187 and n.1 *contra* Evans 1996, 111, Frend 1972, 270. See also Schwartz 1939, 392–3, Honigsmann 1951, 62, Maraval 1998c, 405, Menze 2008a, 154–5, with *Joh. Eph. Lives, PO* 17 (1923), 26 and *Mich. Syr. ix.23* (281c/197). Even after Anthimus' deposition they remained active: see Speigl 1994, 114. *Joh. Eph., Lives, PO* 18 (1924), 687, claims that Severus foresaw that nothing would come of his visit, but Menze 2008a, 268, rightly points out that John wrote this with the benefit of considerable hindsight.

290 See n.224 above on Theodora's lobbying efforts for Severus and his doctrines.

291 Epiphanius died on 5 June 535. Anthimus, who had taken part in the negotiations in 532 (see ix.15 above), was clearly already inclining to anti-Chalcedonianism; while *Vict. Ton.* §121 (a.537), ascribes his promotion to Theodora, Menze 2008a, 198–200, expresses doubts, noting that PZ does not refer to her in this context. The transfer of a bishop from one see to another, however, was an infringement of canon 15 of Nicaea, cf. Frend 1972, 272, and n.309 below. See also Stein 1949, 381, Menze 2008a, 196.

b. In Alexandria, after Gaïanus had been driven out, he who was a Julianist and who was there for three months after the decease of Timothy, Theodosius became bishop. He was a man of conspicuous faith, eloquent, kind, and gentle; and an acquaintance and a friend of the holy Severus.²⁹² While these three heads of the priests were joined together in love and in faith and were inseparable from one another, Ephraem of Antioch was alarmed and became very disturbed,²⁹³ especially over Peter of Jerusalem, who although he was not of his own will contentious²⁹⁴ or a heretic conducted himself according to the times, [136] being weak, lazy, and without vigour.²⁹⁵

c. It happened²⁹⁶ in those days that Sergius, an *archiatros* of Resh'aina, went up to Antioch in order to accuse Asylus, the bishop of [Resh'aina], making known to Patriarch Ephraem that he had been injured by him. He was a man of eloquence and trained in the reading of many books of the Greeks, and in the teaching of Origen. He had read for some time the commentaries of the other teachers of Alexandria on Scripture – he was [also] able to read and speak Syriac – and tracts on medicine.²⁹⁷ He was of his own will

292 Theodosius had already been enthroned as patriarch in February 535, but Gaïanus' supporters had ousted him from the city and installed their nominee instead. In May 535 Justinian sent imperial forces to restore order and to secure Theodosius' position; Gaïanus was exiled. Theodosius remained in Alexandria only until October 536, when he retired to Constantinople, having persisted in his refusal to accept Chalcedon. There he remained until his death in 566, becoming, in effect, the leader of the anti-Chalcedonian movement after the death of Severus in 538. See n.229 above, Frend 1972, 270, 274, Demicheli 1983, 232–5, Noethlichs 2001, 691. From the start of his patriarchate, Theodosius was in contact with Severus and in agreement with his doctrines. His letter to Severus, written just after his restoration, in June 535, testifies to this: see *ep. 1* in *Documenta*, 5–11/1–5 and Severus' reply (of July 535), *ep. 2* in *Documenta*, 12–34/6–22, also translated in Allen and Hayward 2004, 158–68.

293 Ephraem sought a synodical letter from Anthimus even before he succeeded to the patriarchate; what he received was sufficiently ambiguous that he pressed him for greater precision. See Honigsmann 1953, 193, Speigl 1994, 108, Menze 2008a, 198–9 (insisting, however, that Anthimus remained at least outwardly committed to Chalcedon when he assumed office), with Photius, *Bibl.*, cod.228 (vol.4, pp.121–2).

294 Reading with Hamilton-Brooks *hrr'* for *hryy'*.

295 Peter, patriarch of Jerusalem (524–552), seems indeed to have prevaricated. See Grillmeier ii.2, 365/349 with *ACO* iii, pp.152–3, Speigl 1994, 112 and Millar 2008, 71, 78–9. The situation in Constantinople was critical for the Chalcedonian party: see Grillmeier ii.2 365–6/349–50, Schwartz 1939, 393.

296 Here begins a fragment in MS C, fol.151^v, with the title: 'From the Ecclesiastical [History] of Zachariah, from the nineteenth chapter of the ninth discourse. The event that demonstrates the end of Sergius, the *archiatros*.'

297 Sergius of Resh'aina (Theodosiopolis) seems to have started out as an opponent of Chalcedon, as PZ indicates, cf. Barheb. *CE* 205/6–207/8. He studied in Alexandria before moving to Resh'aina, where he evidently quarrelled with the bishop, Asylus. See *PLRE* iii,

a believer, as the prologue and the very apt commentary on Dionysius that he made,²⁹⁸ and the treatise that was created by him concerning the faith²⁹⁹ in the days of the illustrious Peter, the believing bishop,³⁰⁰ bear witness. However, this Sergius was lascivious in his many sexual encounters out of desire for women; he was incontinent, unchaste, and greedy with love of money.³⁰¹ Ephraem examined this man, and finding him to be experienced, promised to do for him anything he asked, if he would be sent from him to Rome with letters for Agapetus, the head of the priests [there], and return. He accepted and was supplied with presents by Ephraem, and carried the letters to [Agapetus] while he was accompanied by Eustathius, [137] a youth [and] an architect from Amida. He spread an account concerning Sergius that is strange, and lest it do harm to the reader, I do not record it.³⁰²

d. These [men] arrived in Rome before Agapetus, gave him the letters, and were received. [Agapetus] was pleased with their letters, in which he

Sergius I, which notes that he might be identical with *PLRE* ii, Sergius 8, a correspondent of Severus and an *archiatros* (chief doctor), the term used here by PZ. On Asylus see Honigmann 1951, 149 n.4: he was among those who interrogated John of Tella at Nisibis in 537, cf. *V. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 76/48. On Sergius' linguistic ability, see the next note.

298 An allusion probably to his introduction to Pseudo-Dionysius' work, preserved in BL Add. 22,370, cf. Wright 1871, 500 (noted in *PZV* ii, 93 n.4). For a survey of Sergius' many translations and original works in the fields of philosophy, medicine and theology, many of which have survived, at least in fragments, see Wright 1894, 89–93, Baumstark 1922, 167–8, Hugonnard-Roche 1987, idem 1997. Sherwood 1952, 175, cites the verdict of Ibn Abi Usaibi'a on Sergius' efforts, 'as a translator he was mediocre'. In the words of Wright 1894, 93, 'As one of the clergy, he wasted his time in making a translation of the works which passed under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite'. On this translation see Sherwood 1952, Hugonnard-Roche 1989, 6, idem 1997, 125, Walker 2006, 181–3.

299 Sergius' theological treatise is not preserved, see Hugonnard-Roche 1997, 125. It is not the preface that he appended to his translation of Pseudo-Dionysius, edited by Sherwood 1960–1; see Sherwood 1952, 179–80.

300 PZ refers to Peter, bishop of Resh'aina, banished in 519, who took part in the talks of 532: see Honigmann 1951, 104–5, Sherwood 1952, 176, cf. n.188 above.

301 Such accusations are no doubt at least in part motivated by his transfer of allegiance to the Chalcedonian side, as Wright 1894, 89, notes. The defections of the doctor Gabriel of Sinjar in Persia in the early seventh century offer a point of comparison: see Greatrex 2003, 81–2.

302 Since Agapetus only became pope in May 535 (n.281 above) and Anthimus patriarch in June 535 (n.291 above), and one must allow time for the news to reach Antioch, Sergius can only have been sent to Rome in late summer 535 at the earliest, more probably in October, cf. Stein 1944, 182. On this appeal to Agapetus and two others reported in *ACO* iii, 136–52, see Millar 2008, 70, 73. The mention of Eustathius, *PLRE* iii, Eustathius 2, clearly indicates the source of his information; this is confirmed by his awareness of the story he prefers not to repeat. Schwartz 1939, 393, notes that Chalcedonians in Constantinople had also made contact with the papacy in order to shore up their position.

found agreement with his inclination. He came with them to Constantinople in the month of March in [indiction year] fourteen, while Severus was there, and [while] Anthimus was the head of the priests.³⁰³ The whole city was disturbed,³⁰⁴ and the earth with all that is upon it shook at the arrival of Agapetus. The sun began to become dark at daytime, and the moon by night, while the ocean was stormy with spray³⁰⁵ from the 24th of the same month of this year until the 24th of June of the following [indiction] year fifteen.³⁰⁶ When Agapetus appeared before the emperor, he was received by him magnificently, because he [spoke] the same language and was the chief of the priests of the region of Italy, which had been conquered and subjugated to [Justinian]. He was instructed in the form of the word of Scripture, but its meaning³⁰⁷ he did not understand, and he held an injurious opinion concerning the embodiment of Jesus, our Lord, the Christ, God the Word; he did not consent to call the virgin Mary 'Birthgiver of God', and he divided the unity into two natures because he maintained the priority of the conception of the infant, like [138] those [of the opinion] of Diodore and Nestorius.³⁰⁸

303 On the date of Agapetus' arrival see Stein 1949, 383: PZ is accurate here. An earlier embassy to Constantinople had been sent in October 535: see Schwartz 1939, 396. He probably set off from Rome in December 535; whatever the urgency of ecclesiastical issues, he had also been urgently commanded by Theodahad to dissuade the emperor from opening hostilities. See Stein 1944, 182 n.2, idem 1949, 343, Grillmeier ii.2, 366/349, Maraval 1998c, 405.

304 This sentence is not in MS A, but is in MS C and in Mich. Syr. ix.23 (284c/200).

305 Following the translation of this awkward phrase in HB 267 n.5. Arjava 2005, 79, notes other possible translations such as 'clouded by moisture' or 'confused by wet clouds', and points out that biblical precedents may have influenced PZ's description (e.g. Luke 21.25); cf. Joh. Lyd. *De Ost.*, p.25, tr. in Arjava 2005, 80, referring to moisture and a dimming of the sun in Europe in indiction 14 (535/6).

306 PZ alludes to the many unusual phenomena caused perhaps by the eruption of a volcano in the southern hemisphere in 536, on which see Koder 1996, 276–7, Farquharson 1996, 266, Meier 2003a, 359–65, Horden 2005, 153, Mitchell 2007, 375–7, citing PZ. Arjava 2005 offers the most comprehensive treatment; he is sceptical of the volcano theory (77–8), preferring (93) to interpret the event as a damp fog, which probably did not spread beyond Europe. See also Meier 2003a, 662, for a full list of ancient references to this event, with Telelis 2004, no.148, cf. (e.g.) PD ii, 70–1/65. The period indicated is from 24 March 536 to 24 June 537.

307 Lit. 'force.'

308 PZ is correct in implying that Justinian was more inclined to back Agapetus because of his intervention in Italy: he had more need now of papal backing, in order to ensure support in the peninsula only now being brought under eastern control, although see Meier 2003a, 221 n.604, who plays down this factor. Leppin 2007, 200, accepts PZ's portrayal of a common language forming a bond between the two men, but suggests that the pope himself made a big impression on the emperor; see also the next note. PZ's accusations against Agapetus, which give the impression that he was a Nestorian, are standard anti-Chalcedonian polemic.

He abstained from communion with Anthimus and Severus, and they even more from [communion with] him. One of them he called an adulterer and the other a Eutychian, and he changed the love of the emperor towards them and set him against them in a disputation,³⁰⁹ and [Justinian] drove them out from the city.³¹⁰ Anthimus, Severus, and Theodosius of Alexandria became united with one another in the letter that we have copied out below, and from then on Anthimus and Severus departed from [Constantinople] to live in hiding, each one of them in the place that was suitable for him.³¹¹

e. Then Menas became [bishop] in the royal city after Anthimus. Sergius the *archiatros* suddenly died there, and Agapetus [died] after him in [those] days by a miracle, his tongue being eaten away and shredded by his teeth; and after him Silverius became [bishop] in Rome.³¹²

309 The accusation of adultery levelled against Anthimus refers to his uncanonical translation from Trebizond to Constantinople (cf. n.291 above): he had thus spurned his original see for another one. See Honigsmann 1953, 187 and cf. *Marc. com. addit.*, a.535.4 and esp. a.536.10. The *Lib. Pont.*, ch.59, pp.142–3 (tr. Davis, 52–3) refers to a heated dispute between pope and emperor about Anthimus, on which see Noethlichs 2001, 692, Leppin 2007, 200–3, Menze 2008a, 200. The accusation of Eutychianism was standard Chalcedonian polemic, cf. *ibid.* 201 and note ix.21c ‘below for Anthimus’ condemnation of Eutyches in a letter to Severus.

310 Incorrect: Severus probably left Constantinople in March 536 (see n.225 above), but Anthimus, having resigned his office, remained there, hidden in a palace by Theodora, up to and beyond her death in 548. See Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 686–7 with Frend 1972, 272 and Menze 2008a, 207. In 536 the synod in Constantinople tried three times to find him, but without success; among those sent to find him was Zachariah of Mytilene. See *ACO* iii, p.154.3 with Honigsmann 1953, 188 and Introduction B (1).

311 This correspondence was also known to Evagrius, who briefly, and somewhat partisanly, summarises it at iv.11, cf. Whitby 2000a, 210. See the discussion of the individual letters below, from which it emerges that Mich. Syr. had access to the original correspondence; moreover, some of the letters at least had been preserved in the papal archives at Rome, where they could still be found in 680 (see n.335 below).

312 Agapetus enjoyed rapid success upon his arrival: already on 13 March Anthimus was deposed as patriarch, and his successor Menas ordained by the pope himself. Since Agapetus died on 22 April, Sergius (see n.297) must have died before then. See Frend 1972, 272, Speigl 1994, 110–11. Agapetus’ grisly end is the sort of death normally attributed to heretics (e.g. Nestorius, cf. PZ iii.1c). Silverius became pope in June 536: see Stein 1949, 345. Despite Agapetus’ death, Justinian persevered in the anti-Miaphysite course he had initiated: a synod was held in Constantinople from 2 May to 4 June under the presidency of Menas, and anathema was declared against Anthimus, Severus, and their followers: see *ACO* iii, pp.126–86 with Frend 1972, 272, Grillmeier ii.2, 367–72/351–5, Maraval 1998c, 406, Greatrex 2007b, 290. Justinian’s *Novel* 42 (of 6 August 536) confirmed these decisions and unleashed a renewed wave of persecution of Severus’ followers (on which see PZ x.1–2 below); see Frend 1972, 273.

a. The twentieth chapter is the letter of Severus to the order of the priests and the monks of the East, that gives information concerning his departure from the royal city.³¹³

‘To the God-loving elders, deacons, heads of the monasteries, and priors, and to the entire holy order of monasticism in the East; Severus, in our Lord peace. Since I am outside the imperial city, that ruler of cities, and outside of prison, the one which some of you, O holy ones, visited and have seen with their own eyes, I have considered it correct to [139] make use of this short letter of mine, and to stir you to supplications before Grace for those [things] that I too consider to be my desertion,³¹⁴ and to make known to you plainly, that these [things] that [have happened] to us are administered by divine providence, confirming to us our action for the preservation of the orthodox faith, for the formation of a new will, with which, as one might say, it is right to clothe oneself in the likeness of a new garment, and for the flight from all heretical opinion and contention. For also Jacob, the head of the fathers, he who became great in the endurance of labours and in patience towards God, when he fled from the barbarians who were in Shechem, and from the dangers that surrounded him there, urged those who dwelt with him to that which I urge you, as it says in Scripture, “Jacob said to his house and to all those who were with him, ‘Put away from among you the foreign gods, and become pure, and change your outer garments. Then let us rise and go up to Bethel, and make a sacrifice there to God, he who answered me in the day of affliction, and saved me on the way on which I travelled.’”³¹⁵ For in truth he saved me from every hope of those who are in opposition, who hate me without a reason, who were mocking me, and who shook their heads and said, as though to Job, ‘His foot has fallen into a snare and he has been caught in a net. Let snares come upon him and let them prevail against him, as though they are thirsting for him. His trap is hidden in the earth, and the net is over his paths.’³¹⁶ The wickedness of these [men] is not sated with blood. The [140] Christ-fearing empress was sufficient for me, and God, through your prayers, directed her to that which is virtuous for

313 The letter (*CPG* 7070[5]) dates from after Severus’ expulsion, i.e. March 536. Mich. Syr. ix.26 (296–8b/221–3) therefore rightly places it after the rest of the dossier (in ix.25). The other letters must predate it and should therefore have been exchanged during the second half of 535. See n.331 below.

314 Or, reading with HB 269 n.2, ‘glory,’ (Brooks) or (*ibid.*), ‘strength’ (Hamilton).

315 Genesis 35.2–3. Severus alludes previously to Genesis 33–34, although in this episode the dangers facing Jacob were the result of the treacherous assault on the Shechemites by two of his sons.

316 Job 18.8–10.

him,³¹⁷ as also Isaiah the prophet cries to those who trust in him, “Do not be afraid, because I have saved you. I called you by your name because you are mine. If you cross through waters, I am with you, and the rivers will not inundate you, and you will not be burned in fire, and flame will not scorch you, because I am the Lord your God, the holy one of Israel, he who saves you.”³¹⁸ The one who said these things has given me not only a marvellous deliverance but also an increase in the number of the faithful; it is true to say he has increased the number of the Lord, and the field of the inheritance of Israel, so that it may not be like those whom Scripture reproves, saying, “You will sow your seed in vain.”³¹⁹ For the pious Anthimus, the head of the bishops of the imperial city, received the chief see, and while having the power to take it, did not want [to do so], but righteously, in true judgment, and with knowledge, hated the wickedness of these [men], and accepted our communion, and that of Pope³²⁰ Theodosius of Alexandria, and of all the shepherds holding our own confession. Therefore, in vain do those who say that they do not accept the Council of Chalcedon as regards the definition of the faith, but in the respect of the rejection of Eutyches and Nestorius, lead [others] astray. [With this tendency] also Flavian was adorned, [he] who was not able to lead your zeal astray. You were not overtaken by Satan and you are able to say as Paul, “His contrivances have not led us astray,”³²¹ and the rest of the letter.

317 See Menze 2008a, 219–20, on this passage. As he notes, Severus is far less complimentary towards the empress in *Lett.*, *ep.i.63* (219–21/197–9), the only other place where he mentions her.

318 Isaiah 43.1–3.

319 Leviticus 26.16.

320 The patriarch of Alexandria was frequently referred to as ‘pope’, cf. Lampe 1961, 1006, Davis 2006, ix.

321 2 Corinthians 2.11. Severus is evidently concerned about the efforts of Justinian to weaken the Chalcedonian line, in order to make it acceptable to its opponents: already in the discussions in 532 he had proposed to the anti-Chalcedonian bishops that they accept certain aspects of Chalcedon: see Brock 1981, S section 7, pp.116–17. This approach, an attempt to circumvent the stumbling block of Chalcedon, now referred to as Neo-Chalcedonianism, was vigorously pursued by the emperor; two edicts of 533 (*C.J.* i.1.7–8) testify to this line, which aimed precisely at undercutting Severus’ rigid rejection of Chalcedon itself. See Frend 1972, 267–8, Grillmeier ii.2, 356/339–40, Speigl 1995, 118–21, Maraval 1998c, 404, Leppin 2007, 197, Menze 2008a, 186–200. On Flavian, see PZ vii n.179. Already under Anastasius Severus had had to combat such an approach: see Grillmeier ii.1, 312–13/276–7 with *Sev. Lett.* i.1, 4–6/4–6, a passage with many similarities to this letter.

a. [141] The twenty-first chapter, which is the letter of Anthimus to Severus of Antioch.³²²

“To our pious and holy brother and fellow servant, the patriarch, my lord Severus; Anthimus in the name of the Lord, peace. While considering in my thought the saying of the Lord which states, “To whomever much has been entrusted, from him much will be asked,”³²³ and the word of the psalm, “Who will ascend the mountain of the lord, and who will stand in his holy place?”³²⁴ and the apostle, who stipulates the nature of him who is set aside for God,³²⁵ I have been in no small fear. For, if among those great heads of the fathers, one called [himself] ‘dust and ashes’³²⁶ and another [called himself] ‘a worm and not a human,’³²⁷ what do I say, [I] who am little and contemptible, who have come to the greatness of this service, while I am not worthy? For the disturbance of the holy churches tears at my soul very much. For [there are] some who, seized because of [their] sins, and as if to demonstrate a means to escape from a variation and confusion which does not exist, tear asunder and divide God the Word who is one and is not divided, and became flesh without change. Therefore I am in much sorrow, [just like] that which is said in the psalm, “Sorrow has seized me because of the sinners who have forsaken your law.”³²⁸ Yet the hope that is with God has given me joy, and I believe that he will confirm his promise and give to us according to what we are lacking, not because we are his friends, but on account of [our] endurance, and that he will compensate [142] all of his chosen ones, the same one who also [gives] to Your Holiness these [gifts] of grace that have been gathered up for you through your own struggles, apostolic exertions, and spiritual teachings as though for that immovable stone,³²⁹ preserving both us and his holy churches from sin since long ago, like an unshakable foundation of the faith. He is the same God who bestowed exaltation upon the humble and greatness upon the small, and strength upon the weak, just as the divine apostle says: “We are all justified through grace,”³³⁰ and they become strong in weakness through divine strength. By an ineffable judgment he has brought also our weakness to become the first in the holy

322 This is *CPG* 7087, Grumel 1972, no.230.

323 Luke 12.48.

324 Psalm 23(24).3.

325 1 Timothy 3; Titus 1.5–9.

326 Genesis 18.27.

327 Psalm 21(22).7.

328 Psalm 118(119).53.

329 Matthew 16.18

330 Titus 3.7.

church that is in the imperial city.³³¹ Thus, while we confess his grace, we ask from you who are pious to supplicate Christ our God to help our wretchedness, and while different [men] have different marks, that of the priests is the preaching of the gospel, for he says, “Speak, priests, and when you ascend the high mountains, proclaim.”³³²

b. With this first, spiritual greeting, abounding in love, I am joined to you, O holy ones, so that while I rejoice in your union as well as in your association and spiritual relationship, I make known according to the ancient laws that I adhere to the one sole definition of faith, the one which [143] those 318 holy fathers who were assembled at Nicaea set down while being guided by the holy spirit, and for this I pray: that I will be able to maintain until the end the definition of the council of 150 holy fathers which was assembled in this imperial city against the impious contenders with the spirit, and not only [these councils] but also the holy council that was assembled in Ephesus against the wicked Nestorius, the leaders of which were the heads of the bishops, worthy of memory for piety and love of God, Celestine [the bishop] of Rome, and Cyril of Alexandria, who with his twelve chapters overthrew Nestorius, that worshipper of a human being.³³³ I agree with them, with all of their writings, and also embrace them as holy law, while together with these holy teachings of Cyril I receive also the document of Zeno, uniting the churches, which is the consummation of the fear of God as well as the annulment of the Council of Chalcedon and of the wicked Tome of Leo.³³⁴

331 This letter must predate Anthimus’ deposition in March 536, despite Frend 1972, 271: see Stein 1944, 183. The date of his conversion to Miaphysitism is uncertain, although Stein 1944, 182, argues that had shown his colours already by summer 535, which also seems to be implied by the start of Severus’ reply (ix.22a below). At an early stage, however, he had accepted all four councils (see n.293 above with Honigmann 1953, 186); cf. Menze 2008a, 196–201. See Honigmann 1953, 187, 192, arguing that all six letters were written soon after the end of July 535, Allen 1981, 184. A brief section of an address of his to Justinian survives, *CPG* 7086, text and tr. in Allen and van Roey 1994, 63–5.

332 Isaiah 40.9.

333 Anthimus refers to the Councils of Nicaea (318), Constantinople (381) and Ephesus (431). On Cyril’s twelve chapters (or anathemas) that Nestorius was called upon to sign, see (e.g.) Frend 1972, 19–20, with PZ iii n.23.

334 Zeno’s *Henoticon*, on which see PZ v.8 and n.121. Kugener 1900b, 470–1, argues that the text is corrupt here and should read instead ‘with the holy teachings of Cyril, I receive the unifying document (Henoticon) of Zeno of pious memory, for the negation of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo’. Anthimus, in rejecting Chalcedon explicitly, seems to have hardened his line: earlier he had been prepared to accept it, but only as regards its disciplinary decisions. See Joh. *Vit. Sev.*, *PO* 2 (1904), 255, Mich. Syr. ix.21 (281b/196) with Menze 2008a, 203, cf n.331 above. Price 2009d, 13 argues, on the other hand, that PZ (and Mich. Syr.) have invented this condemnation.

I confess that God the Word was born before the ages from God the Father. He is the only-begotten [son], consubstantial and coeternal with the Father, through whom all [things] came to be, and through whom everything was established, that light from light, that unchanging and consubstantial image of the invisible Father. At the end of days he became flesh, and became a human being perfectly from the Holy Spirit and from the holy Birthgiver of God and ever-virgin Mary, and took for himself hypostatically flesh that is consubstantial with us. He had a [144] rational and intelligent soul, and he accepted a form like ours except for change, confusion, and sin. For he remained immutable as God; even while he took what was ours, his own [nature] was not lacking in [anything regarding] the divine quality, and through dispensation he made that which [was] from us his own, by a joining that consisted of a natural union. For he who was born without time and without a body from God the Father is the same [as he] who endured a second birth. While he became flesh ineffably from the mother, the virgin who gave birth remained a virgin, even after the birth. For this [reason] we truly confess [her to be] the Birthgiver of God, and the one who was born from her in the flesh is perfect God and perfect human being. He is the same [being] from two natures: one son, one Lord, and one Christ; one nature [which is] that of the Word itself, which, becoming flesh, became a human being. While each one of the natures remained perfect and without confusion, as a [single] word of signification, out of these was gathered an undivided unity. So rightly he is also one of the holy and consubstantial Trinity both before his becoming flesh and after his becoming flesh, while not adding to the number of the Trinity the number of a quaternity. He is impassible in that he is of the nature of the Father, but passible in the flesh which is consubstantial with us.³³⁵ For the Word of God did not suffer in his own nature, but in the flesh that is consubstantial with us, and he suffered in our likeness which he united hypostatically to [his nature]. Gregory the Theologian defined [it], saying, “He was not passible in his divinity, [145]

335 Other doctrinal pronouncements of Anthimus have survived, on which see Grillmeier ii.2, 383–5/366–8, which also offers translations from a Syriac text. In *ACO* ser.2, ii.1, pp.370.18–20, 372.7–8 (cf. Allen and van Roey 1994, 61 and n.331 above), there are two extracts from a declaration of faith (along the same lines) addressed to Justinian which were preserved in the patriarchal library at Constantinople and cited at the Council of Constantinople in 680; see Honigsmann 1953, 191. His declaration here is fully in line with Severan orthodoxy and looks like an effort to go back to the situation under Anastasius, with the *Henoticon* as the basis of agreement: see Grillmeier ii.2, 364/347–8.

[but he was] passible in his humanity.”³³⁶ And he is the same one in miracles and in passions, and providentially he made our passions his own, those which are voluntary and innocent, [being] passible and mortal in the flesh. He [who] intelligibly and rationally became ensouled was consubstantial with us. He allowed himself for the entire time of his dispensation to be passible and mortal, for the purpose mentioned above with respect to his own becoming a human being. I say that it was not in semblance but in truth that he suffered.³³⁷ For in this flesh in which he deigned to suffer he endured voluntary, natural, and innocent passions and death through the cross. By a miracle befitting God, that of the resurrection, he established it and made it impassible and immortal, and thus in every way it was incorruptible, since it came from the union and the *hypostasis* that was from the womb, which was holy and sinless. While thus we recognise the distinction between the elements that ran in the union, which I say are the divine nature and the human [nature], we do not separate them from one another into two [natures], we do not divide into two natures him who is one and ineffable, and we do not confuse through exalting [him] the distinction of the divinity from humanity. We confess Emmanuel, who is one [nature] from two [natures].

c. While I think thus, and standing on this opinion as on a rock, I condemn the deviations from the truth, which are from both sides, and any of those who were impious and erring, their leaders who preceded them. I speak of Valentinus, Marcion, Arius, Macedonius, Eunomius, Apollinarius, and Eutyches, as well as those who, concerning the union with the Word, [146] vainly and impiously confessed the flesh that was taken from us [to be] impassible and immortal, and [claim] that it was joined personally to God the Word. They have introduced an illusion and a fantasy into the great mystery of the immutable and true becoming human of the Lord. I condemn also Paul of Samosata, Photinus, Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius, as well as Theodoret, Andrew, Hiba, Euthérius, Alexander of Hierapolis, Irenaeus of two marriages, Cyrus, John, Barsauma of Persia, the council of Chalcedon, the Tome of Leo, and those who say that he is made known and exists in two natures, namely our Lord Jesus Christ, after the ineffable union, and do not confess that there is one *prosôpon*, one *hypostasis* and [one] nature of God

336 Greg. Naz. *Or.* 40.45 (p.306.28–9), of which a Syriac tr. exists: see de Halleux 1982. Cf. Grillmeier ii.2, 384–5/367–8, for extracts from another text of Anthimus in which he cites Gregory.

337 The emphasis on the reality of Christ’s suffering is of course designed to exclude the doctrines of Julian of Halicarnassus, on whom see n.114 above.

the Word who became flesh and became human.³³⁸ Upon these apostolic, divine, and blameless teachings, O our holy brother, I give to you the right hand of communion, which I hold to until the final breath, while I will not consent to hold communion with anyone who is of an opinion other than this one, because Basil says, ‘He who communicates with heretics indiscriminately is separated from the friendship³³⁹ of Christ.’³⁴⁰ For I know that also you, the pious ones, hold to these [beliefs] and have laboured for a long time. For who is there who in our times has thus waged the contest, exchanging one place for another so that his faith not be shaken? In you I see the teachers of the church, because you have fittingly placed the lamp visibly upon the stand, shining, [as] you are, in deed and word. Therefore it is worthy of Your Piety that for these [reasons] [147] you give us joy with instruction in exchange for our letter.³⁴¹ *Pray for me, O pious one, so that in all things Christ God, through your holy prayers, will guide the days that remain of my life according to what is pleasing to him, and while delivering me from these trials that are set against me, he may make me worthy of his loving kindness, so that I may go [forth] in this faith, while I struggle on its behalf according to the little strength that is in me, so that he will acknowledge even me, according to the saying of the gospel, before my Father who is in heaven.*³⁴² *Send greetings to the brotherhood that is with you. The one that is with me asks for your welfare in the Lord. May you be preserved in health in the Lord and remember me, you who are pious in all things.*’

a. The twenty-second chapter, [which is] the letter of Severus to Anthimus.³⁴³

338 For comparable lists of figures anathematised by opponents of Chalcedon see Theodosius’ letter to Severus in *Documenta* 10/5; the list is identical, save that Theodosius does not mention Photinus. Anthimus is particularly specific, no doubt in order to convince Severus of the genuineness of his support for his views. For details on most of the figures involved see PZ iii nn.137–42, vii n.169. Barsauma was a staunchly dyophysite bishop of Nisibis in the 480s (*EEC*, 169), while Cyrus probably refers to Cyrus of Aegae, an obscure dyophysite author (mentioned by Severus, cf. p.454 below). Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, was a dogged opponent of Cyril of Alexandria until his deposition in 435: see Chadwick 2001, 542–8. On Irenaeus see Introduction, section F, n.73 above.

339 Syr. *prhsy*’, from Gk. *parrhesia*, lit ‘boldness’.

340 Brooks, PZV ii, 100 n.2, wrongly identifies this as an allusion to Basil, *ep.*262.2.

341 We translate here the last paragraph of the letter, which is given by Mich. Syr. ix.25 (290/211, right column), because it is printed by Brooks. PZ in fact just says ‘And the rest, i.e. the greeting of the letter’, and there is no reason to suppose that he did not suppress it himself.

342 Matthew 10.32, Luke 12.8.

343 The title of this letter (*CPG* 7070[6]) is quoted in *ACO* ser.2, ii.1, p.378.2 (at the Council

“To the one who is pious and holy in all things, our brother and fellow minister, the Patriarch Anthimus; Severus in our Lord Jesus Christ our God, peace. [On account] of the letter³⁴⁴ of Your Chastity *to me*, Paul the Apostle gives me the precedent to cry out in a very opportune time, “Thanks be to God for his ineffable gift.”³⁴⁵ For immediately upon your accession to the see of the patriarchal throne of the church in the imperial city, you decided on behalf of the orthodox faith to despise that which is to others an occasion for betraying their faith.³⁴⁶ For in those who wish to cleave to the divine commandments, and to follow the Lord as it is written,³⁴⁷ his wisdom raises up thoughts that are appropriate to our [rank], in deacons, presbyters, and patriarchs, [148] according to the order of their priesthood, just as the head of the fathers, Abraham, after he had settled in many and diverse regions, came to one place, and drank copiously from the well that was in it, that which is named the Well of Oaths, because he made oaths and covenants with the barbarians who were near the place, and he planted fair and prosperous plantations; and lest his [own] thoughts should be dissipated in these [things], there he called on the name of the Lord God who is eternal, and as he said to him, “Your thought may not go after the fairness of these things that have appeared, and because of the agreeable pleasure of the vision [it may] forget God, who alone is eternal. [It is] he [who] made these [things] pleasant that are seen by the eyes, and are pleasant in taste.”³⁴⁸ Therefore Scripture goes on to tell that Abraham planted a field at the Well of Oaths, and there he called out to the name of the Lord God who is eternal.”³⁴⁹ Some have interpreted “field” [to mean] “a wooded field”, others “a planted field,” but Your Piety is [depicted] in each detail [of this passage] allegorically: having settled in various places, you have arrived, as though in a field of excellent fruits, in the “Chief of Oaths”, [as] I call the see of

of Constantinople in 680); it came from the archives at Rome. Mich. Syr. ix.25 (290/211, left column) adds a brief section at the end.

344 This sentence, as HB 276, n.3 indicate, is ungrammatical. Severus’ letter is a reply to Anthimus’, presumably from the time before he came to Constantinople, i.e. summer 535, although (see n.224 above), there is some dispute about when Severus reached the capital. See further n.389 below.

345 2 Corinthians 9.15.

346 Severus implies that no sooner had he obtained his patriarchate did Anthimus make known his anti-Chalcedonian beliefs - an exaggeration, as has been shown (n.334 above).

347 Mark 8.34, 10.21; Luke 9.23, 18.22.

348 An allusion to Genesis 21.22–34. The well was at Beersheba, which means ‘Well of oaths’. The source of the first quotation is unknown.

349 Genesis 21.33.

the imperial city, prolific in worldly fantasy, and [you are] drinking from the plentiful abundance of its stream.³⁵⁰ When you perceived that certain men desired your being debased to a contemptible mind, to one other than that pure coinage [which is] well-versed in the orthodox faith, the eye of your mind was not distracted by the beauty of the world and the glory of its vanities which pass away, but rather, like the image of the head of the fathers,³⁵¹ Abraham, there you called out the name of the Lord [149] God who is eternal, he to whom³⁵² *we shall give an account of [the things] which we have done; and I say like the apostle, "Those temporal [things] which are visible, and those eternal [things] which are invisible, those to which we are called, and in which we believed and were baptised,"*³⁵³ *for if we have hope in Christ only in the things of this life, we are the most wretched of human beings.*³⁵⁴ *And it is right for Your Charity to declare to us these canonical and ecclesiastical [matters] in your letter, the one which you have beautifully written, and we shall indeed rejoice and shall rejoice with you, just as Paul, when he was writing to the Philippians, said.*³⁵⁵ *And we maintain the same faith which you wrote, and we know only one definition of the faith, that of the 318 holy fathers who at Nicaea declared that the Word and the Son of God the Father is the radiance and the offspring of his essence and is consubstantial with him, and that [through] the Holy Spirit for our salvation he became flesh in a flesh consubstantial with us, being ensouled and intelligent without change; and that the flesh that he took also did not transform his own nature or mix with it; and that from two natures, that of the essence of the Word and the [other] from humanity, that which was established through the Holy Spirit and from the Birthgiver of God was shown to be one perfect Emmanuel, lacking [nothing], who is the same*

350 A rather laboured allusion to Anthimus' position as patriarch of the imperial capital. The 'Well of the Oaths' is the Syriac rendering of Heb. Beer-Sheba', which means 'Well of the Seven' or 'Well of the Oath' (Genesis 21.31). LXX reads *phrear horkismou*, which is 'Well of the Oath.' Gk. *horkismos* means also (originally) 'a check (on freedom)', (cf. Lat. *orcus*) and so could mean 'curse' as well. Syr. *mawmata* means both 'oaths' and 'curses' in the Bible (oaths and contracts were always formulated in the Near East with associated curses for breach of contract). Severus, no admirer of Constantinople, is playing on the Gk. interpretation of this word *horkismos*.

351 Mich. Syr. ix.25 (289/210, right column) reads 'like the image of the faith of the head of the fathers'.

352 Brooks here, PZT ii, 149.1–150.17, restores a section from Mich. Syr., which probably fell out of PZ's text (rather than being omitted deliberately), given the grammatical problems posed by this sentence if not.

353 2 Corinthians 4.18.

354 2 Corinthians 15.19.

355 Philippians 2.17, cf. 4.4.

Christ, Son, and Lord, and is one prosôpon and [one] nature of the Word that became flesh, and is not divided into two natures after the union.³⁵⁶ Again, the becoming human did not establish an intellectual distinction of those [things] that flowed into the ineffable union, but rather the becoming human existed and is intelligible to those who in faith examine this great mystery, which is untainted by division and confusion. He resembled us in all things except sin: while he did not forgo the same [150] passions that we have when he became flesh, he has impassibility, in that he remained the same God as he was. For in the flesh he willingly endured the innocent passions, [namely] hunger, thirst, and the fatigue of travel.³⁵⁷ Again, one may add those [passions] which [came from] outside, I mean the scourging, the slaps on the cheek, the piercing of the hands and the feet on the cross with iron [nails]. Yet how was it possible for God the Word, who is from before the ages impassible and immortal, to bring an end to our own passions at last, unless he was united hypostatically to a passible and mortal body? So long as the vehemence of the passions befell that one who suffered, one of the divinity [remained] numb and cool, being impassible. For as the God who was in the flesh suffered, we boast that he was [one of] us, and he set us free through his subjugation of death, and paid off the salvific ransom, and we say neither that he was beyond divine impassibility, nor that he suffered in illusion and hallucination ...

b. ... that merciful Word, he became flesh and became a human being, this is [so] that [the Word] who [is] the second Adam might die the death that prevailed over us, and dissolve its eternal dominion, a death which impassible and immortal flesh cannot endure, because that which is impassible and immortal is not able to suffer and die. For if he did not die our own death for our sins, and destroy this [death] when he rose from the house of the dead with the flesh that resembles the true one with [its] passions, then we are strangers and foreigners to the remedy [151] of the resurrection. For “Christ died for our sins,”³⁵⁸ cries Paul, and again, “Since death [arose] through a human being, through a human being also came the resurrection of the dead. For just as in Adam all die, so do all live in Christ,”³⁵⁹ and again, “Since the children partook of flesh and blood, he also partook of the same likeness as theirs, in order to bring to naught through death the one who had authority over death, that is, Satan, and to free those who, in fear of death, were all

356 Cf. nn.333, 337 above.

357 Lit. ‘of the road.’

358 1 Corinthians 15.3.

359 1 Corinthians 15.21–22.

the time of their lives under the subjection of slavery, for [Satan] does not have authority over the angels, but over the seed of Abraham. Therefore it is necessary for him to resemble his brothers in everything.”³⁶⁰ The seed of Abraham was the passible body of our race, that which Almighty God the Word hypostatically took from the holy virgin, in order to raise with him our own race that had fallen under death through him who was the first of our race. Therefore, while he was one nature and [one] *hypostasis*, it is known that he is the Word of God who became flesh, and also willingly endured the temptation and violence of the natural, human, and innocent passions.³⁶¹ And he performed the divine signs in a divine manner, and he spoke divine [things] and human [things];³⁶² and he did some of them that befit God, and some [he did] in a human fashion. [It is] not because there is a difference in the actions, utterances, miracles, and passions that we fall into a division into two natures [of] the one [who existed] after the ineffable union, and divide these sayings, passions,³⁶³ and actions, since we know that it was the same one who performed these miracles [152] and who suffered, and who spoke [both] divinely and in a human manner.³⁶⁴

c. Briefly stated, these are [the things] on which stand the faith and confession of Christ, ‘to which there is no addition, and from which there is nothing lacking.’³⁶⁵ I make timely use of Qohelet’s holy words [which] befit those who have strayed from the king’s road and have gone on a crooked way, and who rejoice in evil perversity. I speak in the spirit of parables, just as it is said in Scripture.³⁶⁶ According to the law that previously was handed down to the church from the apostles,³⁶⁷ *we place under anathema*

360 Hebrews 2.14–17. The Syriac translator did not know how to translate this passage from the NT Greek; we have resorted to the Peshitta translation, which is perhaps the best rendering of the Gk. of Hebrews 2.16.

361 A few lines here are preserved in Greek in ACO ser.2, ii.1, p.378.3–9 (to the second line of section c, ‘confession of Christ’). Kugener 1900b, 471, notes that the Syriac tr. is often garbled and unclear.

362 This sentence in the Syriac is corrupted. The translation here is taken from the Gk. text.

363 Reading this for ‘sign’, following Gk. *pathê*.

364 Lit. ‘in a providential manner’.

365 Ecclesiastes 3.14. See n.231 on Qohelet.

366 Perhaps an allusion to 1 Corinthians 14.2.

367 Mich. Syr. ix.25 (290–1c/212) gives the text of the section omitted here, a fragment of which is also to be found in BL Add. 12,155, fol.110^r, cf. HB 279 n.5 and PZV ii, 103–4. This version of the letter, however, does not derive from PZ, so Brooks in PZT ii, 152 n.11. It is worth noting that this manuscript (on which see Wright 1871, 937) also offers a summary of the negotiations that took place in Constantinople in 532, fols.108–9, in the same chapter (392); see n.188 above.

those who, being unlearned with regard to [theological] investigation, fall sick [with] an illness that is like a constant and unshakeable leprosy ...³⁶⁸ ... the twelve chapters of Cyril, that took aim at the evil confession³⁶⁹ of the cunning of Nestorius, these which are, according to the prophecy of Habakkuk, the arrows that shoot past in the light,³⁷⁰ that passed through all civilisation and enlightened it, I say to them, 'Ignorant one!' All of his writings are like that, in each of which is accuracy and the beauty of wisdom of the divine and confirmed teachings, and like that which was said by the Lord to Job, "they are kept for us in [this] time of struggle and on the day of battle with enemies."³⁷¹ Ecclesiastical law [153] requires not only that we confess the orthodox teaching, but also that we overcome the blasphemy of the opponents with condemnation, just as the symbol of the 318 holy fathers demonstrated.³⁷²

d. On these [terms] *I rejoice* in communion with Your Piety, and also in inseparable association; I also consent to participate only with those who think and preach these [things] with you. I reject from our own communion those who think or say different [things], as though they are alien and foreign, and I flee from those among them who are without discernment, just as Your Charity³⁷³ has also said, as though [from] that which makes us alien to the boldness of Christ, and gives many an occasion to sin, and just as someone from among those who are wise in divinity says, 'by reason of non-discernment, many have sinned.'³⁷⁴ For if we stand upon this watchtower and guard-post,³⁷⁵ and proclaim this to those who are under our authority, we will hear from them combs of honey, good words, the sweetness of which is healing for the soul. Since therefore you have chosen for yourself to contend in the good fight and have confessed a good confession, I cry out just like Habakkuk the prophet, "I will stand at my watch-post, and will walk upon the rock,"³⁷⁶ and reprove those who strive below. If they [154]

368 Here there is a lacuna in the text, which also occurs in the Arabic version of Mich. Syr.

369 Syr. *bišut šubḥa*, lit. 'evilness of glory,' which is a play on *terīšat šubḥa*, 'orthodoxy,' lit. 'correct glory.' On the twelve chapters see n.333 above.

370 Habbakuk 3.11.

371 Job 38.23.

372 For this excerpt from Mich. Syr., BL Add. 12,155 reads, 'And again after a little he said in the letter ..'

373 Reading for 'your messenger' according to the suggested emendation in PZT ii, 153 n.9.

374 Sirach 27.1.

375 Cf. Habbakuk 2.1.

376 Habbakuk 2.1.

place you under curses and condemnations, say to God with David with great appropriateness, “They will curse, but you will be blessed; those who rise up against me will be ashamed, but your own servant will rejoice.”³⁷⁷ For even those who confess a sound faith, according to the saying of the apostle, “have approached Mount Zion, the holy city of the living God, the Jerusalem which is in heaven, and the myriads of assemblies of angels, and the church of the first-born sons who are inscribed in heaven.”³⁷⁸ How can one shooting from earth strike and confuse those who are in the church that is in heaven? For in vain he has tried and has drawn his bow without profit, even if he dares to shoot upward; for upon himself will the arrows that have been shot come down. For we also heed the one from among those who are wise who says this: “The one who shoots a stone upwards shoots it against his [own] skull,”³⁷⁹ [but] only if we continue until the end armed with the breastplate of the upright faith, and girt in every place *with the whole belt of the spirit*.³⁸⁰ Through this canonical letter we have this communion with Your Piety, the union of the spirit, and the bond of peace, as the apostle says.³⁸¹ Concerning this I will inform our fellow minister, my lord Theodosius,³⁸² the holy pope and head of the bishops of the great and Christ-loving city of Alexandria, who toils apostolically and who [wrote] a [canonical] letter, who remains in danger on behalf of the upright word, [155] increases the work of the talents entrusted to him in each day through love of toil, and constantly rejoices in its manifestation. And when you should write to him as also you have written to us, grasp [him] with the same hands of concord, so that [he may write] a reply with a letter of communion, according to the definitions and the laws of the holy church. Since it is necessary for the love of God that is with you to take care to fulfill these [things] from your [side] also towards him, you will have, according to the prophecy of Isaiah that will come to pass, ‘A wall and an outer wall.’³⁸³ Send greetings to your brotherhood, *your own offspring in our Lord*. The [brotherhood] that is with me asks for your welfare in our Lord.’

377 Psalm 108(109).28.

378 Hebrews 12.22, 23.

379 Sirach 27.25.

380 BL Add. 12,155 reads ‘with all types of spirits.’

381 Cf. Ephesians 4.1–3.

382 Theodosius was still in Alexandria at the time, having been restored with imperial backing by Narses in May 535. See n.229 above, cf. Maspero 1923, 111–29, Stein 1949, 380–1, 384–5.

383 Isaiah 26.1.

a. The twenty-third chapter, [which is] the letter of Severus to Theodosius.³⁸⁴

“To the one who is pious and holy in all things, our brother and fellow minister, the head of the priests, my lord Theodosius; Severus in our Lord, peace. In the book of Judges, that is the [book] of the tribes, it said that the tribe of Judah urged the tribe of Simeon his brother to [form] a confederation of territory, while persuading him [to give] fraternal assistance with these words, “And Judah said to Simeon, his brother, ‘Come with me into my own territory, and let us wage battle with the Canaanites, and I likewise will go into your territory;’ so Simeon went with him.”³⁸⁵ I, holy brother, do not urge your authority to a confederation of war and contention, or to assistance for the sake of the allotment of inheritances, but rather especially to the communion of peace and perfection, for the sake of the one profit of that church of Christ God, the miraculous bride, which he acquired through his own blood. For the holy Anthimus, the head of the priests of the church of the imperial city, while severing the bonds and snares [156] of the bitterness of the heretics, and fending off at times the hidden [attack] of the impious one and at times his open [attack], has assented to what we think, has grasped our own communion through consideration of the sound faith and of the purity [of our doctrines] *without mingling in communion with those who make a long opposing speech*. To my own deficiency he has sent a letter³⁸⁶ of a covenant of communion with a perfect uprightness of confession, and has condemned by name each one who is a heretic and a foreigner [to the faith], and his opinion is not far from the commandments and statutes of the Lord, those which the spiritual fathers passed down according to the holy laws, upon which we all ought to gaze earnestly and say like Job [who was] proven by toils *and virtue*, “I will not turn away [from] gazing upon righteousness.”³⁸⁷ So I eagerly welcomed this act which took place in goodwill as though [it were] a gift of God, and I repeated that saying of the divine Scripture, “This day we know that the Lord is with us, so that all of the nations of the earth will know that the power of the Lord is strong,”³⁸⁸ for these [words] are written in Joshua Bar Nun.

384 CPG 7071 (64) rather than 7070 (7) according to the *Supplementum*, although the two letters are likely to be distinct, since no part of the brief citation in ACO ser.2, ii.1, p.378.13–380.3 – an attack on Chalcedon’s splitting of the nature of Christ – overlaps with this letter.

385 Judges 1.3.

386 A clear indication that Severus was not present in Constantinople at the time of Anthimus’ conversion, cf. Stein 1944, 182.

387 Job 27.6.

388 Joshua 22.31.

b. And it would have been right that the holy head of the bishops Anthimus first hasten towards your evangelical throne, and offer you the first [fruits] of concord, but the necessity of the time, and the distance of the place, and the urgency of the deeds changed the order, so that this would be done secretly. For you know, as a wise teacher of divine teachings, that which is written in the story of John the theologian, the greatest of the [157] *other* evangelist[s], that while the doors were closed for fear of the Jews, the disciples were assembled, and that while the doors were closed this great God and our saviour Jesus Christ appeared miraculously inside [the room], stood in the middle, and said, "Peace be with you."³⁸⁹ Therefore I have attached to this letter and have sent to Your Holiness a copy of my own letter of concord and that of the God-loving head of the priests, that man who was mentioned above, which was [composed] under fear of the Jews.³⁹⁰ Certainly the God-fearing presbyter and steward Theopompus also has made known to you already the story of this course of action, for he too has communicated with us as regards this counsel and action, for which reason I believed that the love of God that is in you will rejoice over it, and will exult all the more when you come across the canonical letters [containing] the covenants.³⁹¹

c. Know, O my most beloved and pious brother, that these Chalcedonian demands do not differ in anything from the promised covenant of Nahash the Ammonite, which he wished to make with the children of Israel, when they said to him, 'Set up a covenant for us and let us serve you,' but he harshly and barbarously returned the reply, 'On this [condition] I will set up for you a covenant, when each of you pluck out your right eyes, and I will set a reproach upon Israel.'³⁹² Therefore, we are in need of much vigilance, of immutable faith, of prayers [158] and entreaties, so that he who protects Israel will not slumber or sleep,³⁹³ and will return the reproach against those who are extravagant and boastful, so that we might not become 'a scorn and

389 John 20.19. The allusion to secret negotiations probably refers to the immediate aftermath of Severus' arrival in Constantinople in September 535: see Stein 1944, 182. Honigsmann 1953, 187, however, argues that the letters were exchanged before Severus' arrival. Anthimus may have initiated contact with Severus (rather than Theodosius) because he knew that he was on his way to the capital; Theodosius' position in Alexandria was in any case fragile (see n.403 below on ix.24). See also Menze 2008a, 204, on these negotiations.

390 By Jews Severus means Chalcedonians, cf. the nickname given to the (Chalcedonian) patriarch Paul of Antioch, 'the Jew', PZ viii n.13.

391 This Theopemptus or Theopompus may well be the presbyter referred to in *ep.2* in *Documenta*, 34/22, who was one of those who brought Theodosius' letter to Severus in June 535.

392 1 Samuel 11.1, 2.

393 Psalm 120(121).4.

a reproach to those who are surrounding us,’ as David elsewhere sings,³⁹⁴ thereby falling from divine [things to be] with those who confess human [things], for there is nothing that is true among unbelievers and enemies of God. To you who are understanding in divine [things], what is said here is a matter of knowledge.’

a. The twenty-fourth chapter, [which is] the letter of Theodosius to Severus.³⁹⁵

‘To the one who is pious and holy in all things, our brother and our fellow minister, the Patriarch, my lord Severus; Theodosius, peace in our Lord. O leader who is beloved to me most of all, rock of Christ and unshakeable protector of the pure faith, very excellent is the blessing that is possessed by our time, which has demonstrated to the holy churches of God your spiritual constancy. *Hence* we too are of good hope and are sure that the blameless image of your virtue, which we possess, will be preserved for us.³⁹⁶ Yet I do not know at which of your virtues I should marvel *first and especially*. For which of these [qualitites] that are yours is either defective or needs superfluous description? If it is that I marvel at the harsh practices of your handsome life [then] the virtue of chastity attracts me towards it, as well as the glorious purity of the upright faith, which rightly [159] demands to precede all of them, and your way of life of labours [done] for a long time for the sake of God, and your sojourning from place to place, and this – that you have chosen to endure in everything so that we would not be turned away from the upright faith. In that same faith, how many times in boldness with Paul under the constraints³⁹⁷ of events have you cried, “Who will separate me from the love of Christ? Anxiety, distress, or persecution?”³⁹⁸ Yet in what category should we place the exactitude of your teaching, through which those who go astray are reproved, and deceit pulled out by the roots, while those who believe are saved and are planted in the upright faith? It seems to me that I heard as though it were Christ our God say to you those [things that were said] to the divine prophet Jeremiah, “See, I have put my words into your mouth. See, I have established you today over the nations and over the kingdoms, to pull out and to uproot, and to destroy and to build and to plant,”³⁹⁹ and again, those [things] that he said concerning Paul, ‘He

394 Psalm 78(79).4.

395 *CPG* 7148.

396 Reading with Mich. Syr. ix.25 (290b/211) for ‘for you (pl.).’

397 Lit ‘their hands.’

398 Romans 8.35.

399 Jeremiah 1.9,10.

is a vessel chosen for me, to bear my name before the nations, before the kingdoms, and before all Israel.⁴⁰⁰

b. These [things] are yours, O divine father, at which it is perhaps easy to marvel, but to do them correctly is not easy, as even now in the watchful labours of your pious soul good things are accomplished for the church of God. For in Christ Jesus those who formerly [160] were far off became near: the pious Anthimus, who henceforth is renowned for [his] practices and faith, he who is the head of the priests and the true pastor of the church of the imperial city, willingly has become a communicant with you, O pious one, and with us, and walks according to our upright faith, [he] who has banished [and] rejected snares and disturbances, trampled on transitory and unstable profit, and believed that human greatness is nothing: with boldness he has preached the upright and unfailing faith, so that because of what has happened, O our honoured father, it is not possible for us to say in word[s] how [much] we have rejoiced, how we thanked God, and what a spiritual feast we made.

c. He made a firm covenant in his canonical letter, and sent [it] to our evangelical throne, as Your Holiness yourself made known beforehand through your honoured letter. Through these [things] that he wrote he made known the entire exactitude of the sound and upright faith, and everything that is of deceit and heresy he has rejected with condemnations, while confessing that he thinks and preaches those [things] that are [in accord] with us, and says these [things]: that he is a participant with those in whose communion also our own holy church rejoices, and professes that he turns his face from those from whom we also turn our face. Henceforth he has explicitly condemned those other names of the impious heresy and the impious synod that was convened in Chalcedon, and the letter of Leo. And when we considered [161] as carefully as possible those [things] that were written to us by him who is a pious man, and in detail examined everything and found nothing that was far from the upright faith, and we saw that even there everyone who is our enemy was attacked, we marvelled exceedingly at your judgment concerning them. We found that the things that were written to you, O holy one, by the pious Anthimus concerning the divine teachings, were in agreement with those things which were also written to us. Since we have found the letter of concord and communion of the holy Anthimus to be of such a kind, in the likeness of the prophet in his time I cry out, “Let the heavens rejoice from on high, and the clouds drip righteousness,”⁴⁰¹ because the Lord has had mercy on his people, and good [things] such as these have

400 Acts 9.15.

401 Isaiah 45.8.

been directed to the holy church of God.

d. Henceforth with outstretched hand we have accepted the act, and we too have made haste towards covenants such as these, and have made the pious man an intimate participant with us, and have dispatched to him a letter of reply, in which we have shone forth the upright and paternal faith and exposed the wrong faith and the lack of reason of the impure ones. And we have sent a copy of this [letter in which], because of these [matters], we have established communion with him to your Paternity, and will give it to any who will come hereafter, lest involuntarily we lead you astray in any of our [affairs], and especially these that concern our holy church. Then it is necessary for me to say that [in order] to preserve for, and attract to, the evangelical see that chief honour that it deserves, so [162] have I made known to you – your holy soul [which is] truly worthy [and] which is careful to do everything with the judgment of and according to the will of God – that [letter] which was written to me. Openly I make known my thought, that my chief honour, and the one which gives me great joy, *is* this: [namely] the honour that is rightly offered to you by everyone. Therefore, I am confident, our pious father, in assenting without hesitation to these things that you have correctly determined for the sake of the holy church. I think that you will not leave off from those [things] that are helping the church, in what you do and what you advise, according to what seems proper to Your Paternity.

e. Rather, the situation being such, our *holy* and honoured father, we wanted to make known also in this letter that we now are seized by such burdens and human humiliation, while every plot⁴⁰² is devised against us, so that either we shall flee of our own accord *or forsake the holy church*, or be driven off by the coercion of others, while they are granted time here also to carry out their [affairs], and lead astray the holy church, for thus we should incite you who suffer with us to prayers on our behalf.⁴⁰³ Yet it is not right for us to add load upon load and burden upon burden. By only saying this much concerning the magnitude of [our] distress,⁴⁰⁴ I show that we are in very truth in need of your pious prayers.⁴⁰⁵ *And if it is that you are not [163] convinced to entreat God through your pious supplications on our behalf, [then] know, O our father, that henceforth we have cut off hope concerning*

402 Reading with HB 286 n.5 *'utda* for *'utra*.

403 Theodosius alludes to the precariousness of his position: he depended on imperial forces to be able to stay in Alexandria. Cf. n. 382 above.

404 Gk. *anagkê*.

405 Mich. Syr. ix.25 (293–4/216–17, left column) provides the remainder of the letter, which PZ chooses to excise. We follow PZV ii, 162.24–163.19 in offering a translation nonetheless.

ourselves, not that there is something lacking in the correctness of the faith – may it not be so – and not that we have become lax in that tenacity in the contest on behalf of the upright faith, but rather that we are driven out from our place, and holy things are surrendered for secular things, those that are in my own response to the [acts of] vengeance of the Chalcedonians.

f. For also in these [responses], I now make use of your prudent words that in every way have drawn me towards you, the wise servant of God. I have declared clearly and I have said openly that more than anything else I have chosen to endure evil rather than to neglect any of the teachings or paternal traditions, those which are in force in our own administration [of the church] – whatever [these may be] – for the support and unerring stability of the upright and apostolic faith and for the refutation and overturning of every empty and profane saying. Send greetings to the brotherhood that is with you; the one that is with me asks for your welfare in our Lord. I pray to the Lord, O our brother, that you be healthy and that you remember me.'

a. The twenty-fifth chapter, [which is] the letter of Anthimus to Theodosius of Alexandria.⁴⁰⁶

'To the one who is pious and holy in all things, our brother and our fellow minister, the patriarch, my lord Theodosius; Anthimus, peace in our Lord. Christ Jesus our God, who called persons [who were] simple, unlearned, and fishermen to be apostles and teachers, and those who before these [were called] from pasturing a flock to be kings and prophets, he who [164] chose the weak and the rejected, as the divine apostle said,⁴⁰⁷ has now also called me, [one who is] deficient, to the work of this spiritual service, by the judgments that he understands, to be the head of this holy church of Constantinople. While I, the sinner, henceforth recall the saying of the Lord that he said through Ezekiel, "You, human being, I have given you as a watchman to those of the house of Israel, and if you hear the word of my mouth giving forewarning from me and saying to the sinner, 'If you sin, you will surely die,'⁴⁰⁸ but do not tell the sinner so that he might take heed, nor the impious, so that he might turn back from his way and live, then the iniquitous one will die in his iniquity, but his blood I will require at your hands,"⁴⁰⁹ and the command of the apostle to Timothy concerning the blamelessness

406 CPG 7088, Grumel 1972, no.231.

407 1 Corinthians 1.27–28.

408 Lit. 'you will die death.'

409 Ezekiel 3.17, 18.

of the episcopacy,⁴¹⁰ I am seized with fear and trembling. While I consider these [things] and the disturbance that is increasing in the holy churches through those who do not think correctly, because they consider the fear of God [as] a business and a sale, and speak wickedness with [words] high over their heads, and divide God the Word, he who without change became flesh and became a human being perfectly, I am seized with weeping and groans, and I mourn over myself who am not worthy. But trust in God comforts me, as it was said, “Observe the former generations and see: who believed in the Lord [165] and was shamed? Or who persisted in his fear [of God] and was abandoned? And who called on him and he turned away from him? For the Lord is merciful and compassionate, and forgives sins and saves in time of affliction.”⁴¹¹ Therefore I place all my hope and thoughts upon him, that he will see these [things] of ours and hear, he who made the eyes and fashioned the ear, and that he will reprove the disturbance of those who pervert the correct ways, and will call *with a saying to his servants*, as the true shepherd, who lays [down] his soul for the sake of his sheep; because he said, *he who does not lie*, ‘No one will snatch them from my hands.’⁴¹² For he preordained Your Holiness to stand at the head of the people of Alexandria the Great, and established you as the tiller of the church, not in calm, but in the disturbance of storms *being one who is capable*, so that you could guide the ship over the waves to the peace of the harbour of Christ our God, by the holy, adored, and *life-giving* Spirit.⁴¹³ For by the prayers of your holy fathers, the previous governors, as though by the grace *of God* you have been entrusted to stand at the head of the *Christ-loving* people, who *through the true and unshakeable faith* followed the teaching of the fathers, and [who] contend in deed and in word to the death for the sake of their pastor.

b. Therefore, while embracing your unity and equality of brotherly thought that is in Christ, and the ecclesiastical laws, we make known through this synodal letter that we hold to the one definition of the faith, the one of Nicaea, that which the 318 holy fathers defined, and the 150 who gathered here [166] against the contenders with the Spirit, and the holy council that was assembled in Ephesus, with the assent of Celestine, and the attendance of Cyril, who in the Twelve Chapters that he wrote nullified the teaching of Nestorius.⁴¹⁴ I agree with those and I embrace the rest of his writings, and I

410 An allusion to 1 Timothy 4 probably, cf. 1 Timothy 6.11–20.

411 Sirach 2.10–11.

412 John 10.29.

413 This is a play on the meaning of Syr. *ruḥa*, which also means ‘wind.’

414 Anthimus essentially repeats what he had earlier written to Severus by way of a proof of his adherence to their anti-Chalcedonian doctrines. See PZ ix.21b.

accept the book of Zeno uniting the churches, which was for the nullification of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo. I confess God the Word, the only-begotten, who was born from the Father eternally, through whom all things came to be, the light that is from light, the living image of the Father and consubstantial with him; at the end of times through the Holy Spirit and from the virgin Mary he became flesh, and became a human being perfectly, without change or confusion, like us in everything except sin. He remained immutable God; and while he took our [nature], he did not lack anything in his divinity, and that which is ours he made his own by economy, through a natural union. For the one who was born timelessly and without a body from God the Father is the same one who was born a second time when he accepted the flesh. While being born ineffably from the virgin mother, and while she gave birth to him she remained in her virginity. And I rightly confess her [to be] the Birthgiver of God, and him who was born from her in the flesh, that he is perfect god and perfect human, while he is the same, from two natures, one son, one lord, and one Christ, and one nature of God the Word who became flesh, and each one of these natures that [167] was gathered in a union without division remained without confusion.

c. Therefore he is very justly one of the holy Trinity and equal in nature, both before he became embodied and after he became embodied, and there was not added to the Trinity a fourth number. He is impassible in that he is of the nature of the Father, but passible in the flesh in that he is of our own nature. For the Word of God did not suffer in his own nature, but rather in the flesh consubstantial with us, and he suffered in our likeness, that which was hypostatically joined to him. Gregory the Theologian defined [it] and said [that he is] not passible in divinity, [but] passible in the taking [of a human body],⁴¹⁵ and he was the same one in miracles and in the passions, and by economy he made our voluntary and innocent sufferings his own. In the ensouled and intelligible flesh consubstantial with us he was passible and mortal, and *he let* [his flesh be] passible and mortal during the entire time of his economy; he suffered not in semblance but in truth and in the flesh that was capable of suffering he suffered and died on the cross, and by a resurrection appropriate to God he established it and made it impassible and immortal, and in every way incorruptible, since it was from the union that was of the womb that was holy and without sin. Therefore, while recognising the distinction between these [elements] that went into the unity, I mean the nature of the divinity and of the humanity, we neither separate them from one another, nor into two; nor do we distinguish that one by

415 Greg. Naz. *Or.*40.45, see n.336 above.

[means of] two natures, nor yet do we make a confusion while rejecting the distinction between the divinity and the humanity. We confess him who is one from two, Emmanuel. And thinking thus and on this thought, as [168] though on a rock, I stand and condemn the deviation from the truth of such and such persons.” And the rest [of the letter], which is the asking of the well-being that is in the [end of the] letter.⁴¹⁶

a. The twenty-sixth chapter of the ninth book, [which is] the letter of Theodosius to Anthimus, the head of the priests.⁴¹⁷

‘To the pious and holy one in all things, our brother and our fellow minister, the head of the bishops and patriarch, my lord Anthimus; Theodosius, peace in our Lord. And how could it have been otherwise that you, a chief of the priests, wise and watchful towards the Creator of all and the Saviour and God, should in these matters show yourself openly, you who are crying out like Jeremiah the divine prophet, “I have not become weary while going after you, and I have not desired the day of a human being,”⁴¹⁸ unless you despised the honour which is like [the honour] of human beings, and placed the observance of the fear of God before everything? Therefore, the thing that has been thus done by Your Holiness is great without debate, and all the faithful who have learned of it marvel at it even now in all of the holy churches, and also henceforth all of the servants of the Lord who will [ever live]⁴¹⁹ will marvel at it when it is proclaimed in all of the holy churches. Yet it is not more exalted than the rest of your apostolic and truly sublime and holy life. For it was truly fitting for you, who by unceasing energy [169] of asceticism have mortified your members that are on earth, as it says scripturally, and with Paul you are able to say, “I am crucified with Christ, but I am alive now, not I, but Christ [who is] alive in me,”⁴²⁰ such that in the likeness of Moses, that great one, you consider the shame of Christ a great wealth, greater than the treasures of this world, and would rather be afflicted with the people of God than possess the temporal pleasure of sin.⁴²¹

b. For I, who am weak, if I endure all of the burdens that happen to me because of my shortcomings, because I am bound to accept the face of the church which is under the evangelical throne, which is now enduring many evil [things] – and how much it is enduring it is not easy to say – in the

416 See n.442 below on the condemnations omitted here.

417 *CPG* 7149.

418 Cf. Jeremiah 17.16.

419 Lit. ‘be.’

420 Galatians 2.20.

421 Hebrews 11.25–26.

present circumstances I say as the divine Paul said, “As the sufferings of Christ are many in us, so also has our consolation in Christ grows.”⁴²² For this [fact] that you, the pious head of the priests and patriarch of the imperial city, are using boldness on behalf of the upright and apostolic faith, and are eager to show that you have the same thought and are in accord concerning the strict observance of the divine teachings with Severus, the holy patriarch of the eastern churches, has almost made me [here] in the evangelical see and resting place of the divine Mark forget all the troubles which are upon us. “What thanks are we able to render to God?”⁴²³ For these apostolic words I use even now on account of that help [by which] he has helped his holy churches, [170] who has now established you as a stabiliser of these and a foremost fighter [against] threats to the fear of God. For you have demonstrated, O pious one, that you have as a dweller in you that holy saying of the Lord which states, “Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but are unable to kill the soul; fear more the one who is able to destroy both the soul and the body in Gehenna,”⁴²⁴ and [which also says] “Consider that the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that will be revealed in us.”⁴²⁵ While just as your spiritual light thus shines before human beings, God is glorified by this great increase of those who are saved, [those] whom his true church receives.

c. Therefore I delight with rejoicing and I exult: I have received the canonical letter of agreement and union of Your Piety that now has been conveyed to me,⁴²⁶ because the holy patriarch Severus, who was mentioned above, made known to me already that it was coming to me, he who is the cause of all good things and assistance for the church of Christ and for me. He has also sent me, as is pleasing to him, a copy of that which you had written canonically to one another, which also made known your communion, which was [done] very clearly and expediently.

d. While I concentrate on this letter with my entire mind, I say these things to Your Holiness which I also wrote to him,⁴²⁷ that I confess the one definition of the faith and I accept that which at Nicaea our 318 fathers set

422 2 Corinthians 1.5.

423 1 Thessalonians 3.9.

424 Matthew 10.28.

425 Romans 8.18.

426 What follows is not found in Mich. Syr.; his version only resumes at the start of section g.

427 Theodosius refers not to the letter given above at ix.24, but rather to the one he wrote to Severus upon his election to the see, i.e. *ep.1* in *Documenta* 7–10/2–4, in particular to the confession of faith he made there to Severus in June 535, much of which he here repeats verbatim.

down through the Holy Spirit, and the definition [of] the synod of the 150, and of the one at Ephesus that [took place] through our father Cyril, who in the Twelve Chapters rejected Nestorius, and [171] I accept the letter of the union of the churches of Zeno, which was the annulment of the Council of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo, while I confess that God the Word, consubstantial with the eternal Father, light from light, true God who is from true God, became flesh and also became a human being through the Holy Spirit and from the ever-virgin Mary, ensouled and intelligible flesh, consubstantial with us, and he resembled us in all things except for sin.⁴²⁸ For “He did not sin, and no guile was found in his mouth,”⁴²⁹ as Scripture said. For it was right and just that the nature that was defeated in Adam through Christ should put on a crown [of victory] over death. So therefore the apostle also said, “Since the children partook of flesh and blood,⁴³⁰ he also in like manner partook of the same [things], so that through death he should bring to naught the one who held the power of death, the one who is Satan, and free them who through fear of death were subjects of sin for all the time of their lives.”⁴³¹

e. But if we were defeated in another nature, and the Word of God did not partake of it or make the same flesh that he took from us and [which] was hypostatically united to him impassible and immortal through the union with him, as some foolishly say, then our faith is empty, because it is not great that Satan should be defeated by the Lord, but rather [that] he suffered passions that were innocent in a body that was passible and consubstantial with us and underwent death, and trampled on the sting of sin, and loosened the power of death. Now, if he took the seed of Abraham, and resembled us, his brothers, in everything except sin, as the wise Paul said,⁴³² [172] and through the very death that he received in his flesh he was victorious over Satan, who had held the power of death, while he remained impassible with the passions, for which he is known and is justly God, [then] on account of his victory we glory, because we have been freed from the yoke of servitude.⁴³³

428 Cf. ix.21b for this declaration of faith.

429 1 Peter 2.22.

430 Omitted in BL Add 12,155; required by the following plural object pronoun; so also in the letter to Severus (*Documenta*, p.8).

431 Hebrews 2.14–15.

432 Cf. Hebrews 2.16–17.

433 Theodosius offers the customary rejection of Julianist views, according to which Christ merely appeared to suffer. See n.114 above.

f. Henceforth, who is it who will not marvel at the accuracy of the divine words which in every place bring uprightness, and with the same [words] refute the delirium of Eutyches, and those resembling him, and the teaching of Nestorius? For Paul says, “Christ partook of our likeness in flesh and blood,”⁴³⁴ and so that no one might think that [it was] in fantasy he went on to say, “he partook of the same [flesh and blood as humanity], so that through death he might nullify the power of death.”⁴³⁵

g. Again, with an example from children they contend against those who divide the one Christ into two natures. For just like a child and a human being [in] our own [case],⁴³⁶ consisting of soul and body, are one [entity] from two [words], and the two are said to be one nature, while the soul is not transformed into flesh, and the body is not changed into the essence⁴³⁷ of the soul, so also is Christ, who is from the two of them, divinity as well as humanity, which are perfectly each in its own subject.⁴³⁸ They are one and not separate, and moreover the union is not confused in him in that *he united to himself hypostatically flesh consubstantial with us and*⁴³⁹ allowed it in all the economy to be passible and mortal, although the same [being] was holy [and] without sin, and through the resurrection made it impassible and immortal, and in every manner [173] incorruptible. For our former⁴⁴⁰ wise father Cyril said, ‘He first raised his body in incorruption, and he first exalted it to heaven.’⁴⁴¹ While therefore I also think thus, I condemn so-and-so ... *I depend on Your Charity and Your Fraternity*.⁴⁴²

434 Hebrews 2.14.

435 Hebrews 2.15.

436 Mich. Syr. ix.25 (295b/219), ‘who is our human being;’ *ep.1* in *Documenta* (p.9), ‘who is like us and a human being.’

437 Gk. *ousia*.

438 Syr. *mellta*, translation of Gk. *logos*.

439 This sentence, as HB 294 n.4 observed, is unintelligible in the text. From comparison with the letter of Theodosius to Severus, the words in italics have fallen out of our MS.

440 Hamilton observed (HB 295 n.1) that this word might have been accidentally copied here from below; it is not in the letter of Theodosius to Severus, *Documenta*, p.10.6–7.

441 This citation from Cyril has not been identified.

442 So Mich. Syr. ix.25 (295b/219), who condenses this final section even more than PZ, and *Documenta*, 11/5 (the conclusion); this version, however, offers the full list of those condemned (10/4–5). No doubt PZ excised the list, since he had already offered a nearly identical one at ix.21c above, cf. n.339. BL Add. 12,155 reads: ‘And the rest of the greeting that is in the letter.’

BOOK TEN

[173] a. In this tenth book and also in the sixteen chapters that it contains written out below, are what took place in sequence from the time of [indiction year] fifteen, that is, the year 848 in the reckoning of the Greeks, until the completion of [indiction year] thirteen, [that is,] the year 859¹ during the reign of the present serene Emperor Justinian.²

The first chapter concerns [the patriarch of Antioch] Ephraem, who went down to the East. The second [chapter] concerns those [things] that Bar Kaili did in Amida in the fifteenth [indiction year] and in the second [year]. The third [chapter] concerns the priest Cyrus from the village of Legina, who was burnt in the Tetrapylon of Amida.³ The fourth [chapter] concerns the letter of Rabbula of Edessa that [was written] to Gemellinus of Pêrîn (Perrhê) concerning those who eat the holy [communion] as though it were mere bread. The fifth [chapter] concerns the dedication of the church in Antioch, and also the synod that [Patriarch] Ephraem assembled [there]. The sixth [chapter] concerns Khusro, the king of Persia, who went up and captured Sura, Aleppo (Beroea), and Antioch.⁴ The seventh [chapter] concerns Belisarius, who went down and captured Sisaurana, a fortress

1 536/7 to (probably) 547/8. The synchronism for the terminus date is incorrect, since indiction 13 correlates to the year 549/50. As HB 296 n.2 point out, the earlier date should be accepted, since Rome was taken by Totila in December 546 (see [e.g.] Evans 1996, 174), and this is the last event recorded in the book (x.15).

2 As elsewhere, PZ clearly indicates that he is writing this section at least during the reign of Justinian.

3 Details of the execution of Cyrus, who refused to take communion from the Chalcedonian bishop of Amida, Abraham bar Kaili, are provided by PD ii, 32–7/32–5, cf. Mich. Syr. ix.16 (272c/181–2) and the allusion at Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 524. See also Witakowski 1991, 260, on Mich. Syr.'s use of Joh. Eph. here. On Legina see PZ viii n.103. A tetrapylon was a monumental group of four arches arranged around a square, generally at the intersection of major streets, i.e. in the city centre, cf. ODB i, 152.

4 The main primary account of Khusro's invasion in 540 is provided by Proc. Wars ii.5–13. See Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 102–8, for a narrative and analysis of other sources, cf. Meier 2003a, 313–20, Boerm 2006.

in Persia.⁵ The eighth [chapter] concerns Khusro, who went up [174] and captured Callinicum and the rest of the border garrisons of the Euphrates and Khabur [Rivers].⁶ The ninth [chapter] concerns the plague of tumours. The tenth [chapter] concerns Martin and Justus, who entered Persian Armenia and returned.⁷ The eleventh [chapter] concerns Khusro, who went up to Edessa but did not capture it and [then] returned.⁸ The twelfth [chapter] concerns Jacob and Theodore the pious, believing bishops, who were ordained⁹ and were sent to the East and to whom the leadership was entrusted. The thirteenth [chapter] concerns Lazica,¹⁰ which was captured by Khusro. The fourteenth [chapter] concerns the scarcity of grain and the shortage of types of green vegetables that occurred in [indiction years] nine and ten. The fifteenth [chapter] concerns Rome, which the barbarians captured and sacked. The sixteenth [chapter] concerns the decorations and buildings of Rome.

a. The first chapter of the tenth book.

When Severus [of Antioch] and Anthimus [of Constantinople], the believing chief priests, were expelled by the emperor, as was said above in the ninth book, and they departed from the royal city when Agapetus of Rome arrived, who died suddenly at the end of the month of March [in year] fourteen, and Sergius the chief doctor who brought him [also died],¹¹ Ephraem, who was in Antioch in the East, became strong and powerful.¹²

5 Belisarius' counter-offensive, in which he captured Sisauranon, took place in 541: see Proc. *Wars* ii.16, 18–19, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 108–9.

6 Khusro's riposte of 542, which met with only limited success, although he sacked Callinicum. See Proc. *Wars* ii.20–1, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 109–12.

7 A reference to the Roman invasion of Persarmenia of 542 or 543, on which see Proc. *Wars* ii.24.12–25.35, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 116 (dating it to 542); it culminated in the rout of the poorly co-ordinated Roman army at Anglon. Cf. *PLRE* iii, Martinus 2 and Justus 2: the former was involved in the defeat at Anglon, the latter undertook a separate invasion of Persian territory. Meier 2003a, 320 n.84, argues in favour of the traditional chronology, i.e. 543, largely on the grounds that the alternative compresses too many events into a limited time.

8 Khusro's unsuccessful attempt on Edessa took place in 543 or 544. See Proc. *Wars* ii.26–7, viii.14.35–7, Evagr. iv.27, with Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 113 (dating it to 543, although it has usually been placed in 544, cf. e.g. Stein 1949, 501).

9 Lit. 'blessed.'

10 Lit. 'the territory of the Lazicans'

11 PZ takes up where he left off at ix.19. Severus had left Constantinople in March 536, while Anthimus had been sheltered by Theodora somewhere in the capital. See PZ ix.19c-d with n.310.

12 Ephraem's vigorous measures to enforce Chalcedonian orthodoxy, in the wake of the unambiguous condemnation of Severus, receive a wide press in the Miaphysite sources, cf. PD

When he sent [to ask from the emperor ...]¹³ he sent [a *large* army]¹⁴ and Clementinus¹⁵ ... he received the command in [*Kanun*] in [indiction year] fifteen,¹⁶ to cross through the jurisdiction of the East and to go around and to admonish it in word. Clementinus [was to] coerce the inhabitants of the cities in the East to accept the Council [of Chalcedon], just as the rest of the inhabitants of Italy [175], the province of Rome, [did].

b. This Ephraem went to Aleppo (Beroea), Qenneshrin (Chalcis), Mabbugh (Hierapolis), Batnan (Batnae), Edessa, Sura, Callinicum and the rest of the border region, Resh'aina (Theodosiopolis), Amida, and Tella (Constantia), accompanied by Clementinus. He subjugated many; some by [his] word and [by] promises of favour from the emperor, some with the threat of punishments, exile, seizure of possessions, loss of rank and exclusion from all skilled professions, and they persecuted others and drove [them] from place to place, including monks who were found to be approved in the faith and true believers under ordeal.¹⁷ The winter was [so] harsh that from the unusual amount of snow the winged creatures perished, and ... there was affliction ... that people in ... from awful things and ... not in each place that they were exposed to it.¹⁸ From the mountain of Singara, which is in Persia, the believing bishop John of Tella (Constantia) was seized by someone named Com[itas?]¹⁹ and he was incarcerated in Antioch, being

ii, 38–9/37, who concentrates, however, on Abraham bar Kaili at Amida. See also *V. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 65/42, Mich. Syr. ix.24 (286–7b/206–7) with Menze 2008a, 118, 135. PD also refers to the intervention of Roman soldiers, summoned by the patriarch. See Frend 1972, 273–4, Palmer 1990, 146, Grillmeier ii.3, 358–9, Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 62–3, Maraval 1998c, 407. Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 293–4, compares the patriarch to the anti-Christ, cf. Menze 2008a, 235–44. Comparable tours of the frontier region was undertaken by patriarch Gregory of Antioch in the early 590s (Evagr. vi.22) and bishop Domitian of Melitene in 598/9, see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 176. On the effects of these bouts of persecution see Greatrex 2007b, 290.

13 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.24 (287b/206), though something is still missing.

14 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.24 (287b/206). The 'large' is Brooks' insertion.

15 For Clementinus, see *PLRE* iii, Clementinus 2 (although the date should be 536, not 537).

16 Ephraem's campaign took place over the winter of 536–7. The month, in Syriac *Kanun*, is restored by Brooks, cf. *PZT* ii, 118 n.7, partly using information from the *V. Ioh. ep. Tel.* It could refer to either December 536 or January 537, since it is not certain whether it refers to the first or second of the two months called *Kanun*.

17 It is clear from PZ's description that Ephraem's tactics of employing a mixture of threats and promises paid off. Frend 1972, 273 n.4, notes how John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, 36 (PG 87.3, 2884C–2885C) reports his conversion of a stylite near Hierapolis. Cf. Menze 2008a, 110–11, suggesting that Joh. Eph.'s vivid picture of persecution is exaggerated.

18 See PZ ix n.306 on the climate change perceptible in 536–7; cf. Meier 2003a, 662, Telis 2004, no.148, Arjava 2005, 79, for references to this severe winter.

19 Supplied from *V. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 66/42.

confined, but he did not change his true [faith]²⁰ and he remained in his affliction until the beginning of the first [indiction year], and in prison there [his life] ended.²¹ [The monks of the East]²² ... and they were driven from their monasteries and lived in various places in the wilderness until [indiction year] three, when Khusro went up against it and captured Sura, Aleppo (Beroea), and Antioch.²³ [Bishop] Theodosius of Alexandria was summoned by the emperor, and he went up with a few bishops who were under his jurisdiction. In no way did he accept the Council of Chalcedon until Paul was appointed [bishop] there [in Alexandria] in the first year.²⁴

c. When Theodosius and the bishops [176] who were with him arrived before the emperor, their arrival was reported to Ephraem in writing while he was in Amida and he contemplated leaving there. Theodosius and those who were with him appeared before the emperor and ... and because they did not agree, they were removed to a certain place and remained there, and the queen was solicitous for their honour, and no one from among their acquaintances or other distinguished [persons] was prevented from seeing them and taking care of them²⁵ ... their ... he went up ... [indiction year] fifteen ... and ... the emperor ... much ... said to him concerning someone²⁶

20 Supplied by Brooks by analogy from PZ vii.6g (PZV ii, 38.27).

21 *V. Ioh. ep. Tel.* 66/42–3 narrates the hunting down and capture of John, bishop of Tella in greater detail, cf. Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 522–3. He was captured in February 537 by a joint force of Romans and Persians in the Jebel Sinjar. See Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 98–9, 101, for a translation of sections with Greatrex 1998, 218; on this part of his *Life* by Elias see Menze 2008a, 162–3 (on Comitas), 231–5.

22 Brooks here has fleshed out the fragments of PZ on the basis of probability, since Mich. Syr. does not have this section.

23 Indiction year 3 is 539/40; on Khusro's invasion see n.4 above. The expulsion in winter-time may have been deliberate, as the same technique had been applied in the 520s. See Menze 2008a, 113, 143.

24 Theodosius was summoned from Alexandria in December 536. When he continued in his opposition to Chalcedon, he was deposed at the end of the following year and replaced by Paul the Tabennesiot. Theodosius was briefly confined in Derkos, a fortress in Thrace, but then sheltered by Theodora in the capital. See Maspero 1923, 127–30, Stein 1949, 384–5, Frend 1972, 274–5, Carta Paolucci 1992, 60–6, Maraval 1998c, 407. Despite the implication of PZ's phrasing, he did not waver in his opposition to Chalcedon, even after the appointment of Paul: see next note.

25 PZ describes the group of anti-Chalcedonians sheltered in the palace of Hormisdas by Theodora, on which see PZ ix n.223.

26 PZ refers here to the attempted coup at Dara by John Cottistis in 537, on which see also Proc. Wars i.26.5–12 and Marc. *com. addit.* a.537.4 with Greatrex 1998, 220 and Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 101.

... by the name of But²⁷ ... who plotted a rebellion in Dara in the summer of the same year who was pu[t to death], and he freed the emperor from mental stress; in what way I am truly not aware so as²⁸ [to be in a position] to write, and for this [reason] I [remain] silent.²⁹

d. Since Paul, who [succeeded] Theodosius [in Alexandria], shut [his archdeacon]³⁰ in a bath-house because of his zeal for the faith and suffocated [him] – he who was not in [agreement with him] – he seized his son and put him in prison, so that he would not make his father's death known. Then it happened that he escaped and arrived before the empress, and through faithful acquaintances of his father he informed [her] concerning his fearsome death. On account of this, [Patriarch] Ephraem of Antioch was sent to Alexandria, along with Abraham Bar Kaili. As they were passing through Palestine they took with them a monk by the name of Zoilus, and they went to Alexandria. They investigated the action of Paul, and expelled him from his see. They seated [in Paul's place] Zoilus, a Synodalist.³¹ For the protection of this [man] from the anger of the people of the city they appointed there as *chiliarch*³² over the soldiers Acacius Bar Eshkapa of Amida.³³

27 The identity of this individual, But... or Cut... is unclear (PZV ii, 176.11), but two possible identifications may be suggested. One is Boutzes, who, according to *PLRE* iii, Buzes, is otherwise unattested between 531 and 539 and who was last heard of defending Martyropolis (at ix.6a). He is the only individual in PZ whose name begins with these three letters, cf. ix.2 (93.13). On the other hand, Marc. *com. addit.* 536.1 refers to a *dux* Batzas in Euphratesia who successfully deflected an Arab incursion in that year; if we follow *PLRE* iii and separate this Batzas (1) from Batzas 2, who was appointed to an Italian command in 537 and sent in that year to reinforce Belisarius, then the reference could be to him. One would, however, expect an aleph and not a waw in the Syriac version of his name.

28 Or 'not permitted'.

29 PZ's reticence is noteworthy, cf. ix.19c.

30 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.24 (287b/207).

31 Paul the Tabennesiot was as vigorous as Ephraem in imposing orthodoxy in Egypt. He overreached himself, however, in seeking to have the *dux* Elias (*PLRE* iii, Elias 3) removed from office; he then arrested a deacon who had warned Elias of his plans and had him imprisoned through the prefect Rhodon (*PLRE* iii, Rhodon). When this deacon died in prison, this naturally provoked a scandal, especially since his family had connections in Constantinople. A council was held in Gaza in early 540 that deposed him; he was replaced by the Palestinian monk Zoilus. See Proc. *Anecd.* 27.3–19, Lib. *Brev.* 23/158–62 with Maspero 1923, 136–51, Stein 1949, 389–91, Demicheli 1983, 235–9, Maraval 1998c, 407.

32 Syr. *klyrk'*. On the term see PZ ix n.48.

33 Acacius, the son of a cobbler, perhaps lies behind PZ's account of these details. See Maspero 1923, 151 n.4 and idem 1912, 88, on the tribunes of Egypt (which PZ may well be indicating by his reference to a *chiliarch*), who were the commanders directly subordinate to the *dux*.

a. [177] Chapter Two of Book Ten concerns those [things] that Abraham Bar Kaili *did in Amida*...³⁴

Bar Kaili was [bishop for] thirty years.³⁵ He was a good-looking man, polished, and one who used to take care of his body. After [some time], instead of white [hair] on his head and beard, his hair appeared black. When the people from Amida were investigating [this] novel matter that had occurred, they said that a bad period had been predicted³⁶... Amida explaining the sorrow ... and there was a custom in [the city] during the days of suffering of the fast, on the days when all who were imprisoned by the law were released, and there occurred no punishment, he forced them to hand them over and sent them for judgment and confinement; many were beaten, while others were incarcerated, and some were burned in the Tetrapylon.³⁷ While on Wednesday and Friday of every week during the Great Fast supplications and prayers took place, at evening-time he would approach and be given communion. But because this old man Abraham bar Kaili regularly took nourishment during the day, and was ashamed before humans but not before God, he ended up in great sin, having the passion of gluttony. Taking choice pastries and spiced wine he nourished his body during the daytime, and at the time of evening he offered the offering before the people with ostentation and would partake [of it]. This I wrote not in spite but [178] because in truth I learned it from his priests and his deacons, and while I do not wish to [do so], I have written it as an admonition, [and] also so that when it is circulated to readers and hearers prayer on his behalf may be offered so that God will forgive him because the Lord is also gracious, and forgives sinners and does not destroy [them].³⁸ For also an Egyptian father who was a Gnostic saw the corpse of a sinful man who was being buried

34 Brooks here reconstructs PZ on the basis of Mich. Syr. ix.26 (297b/223–4): see PZV ii, 120 n.5. Chabot, in his tr. of Mich. Syr, vol.2, 222 n.1, suggested that another section on Abraham being forced to flee Amida when his measures proved too drastic, leading to the brutal intervention of a certain Bar Yohannan and the execution of several anti-Chalcedonians, also probably comes from PZ x.2. Given that these details are not to be found in PD ii, 32–7/32–5, derived from Joh. Eph., Michael's other chief source, this seems highly plausible. See Menze 2008a, 115–17, on these events, who translates part of Mich. Syr.'s text into English.

35 Cf. Menze 2008a, 237 (unaware of PZ's reference to his tenure). As Menze 2008a, 235–44, shows, Abraham was clearly an effective leader, despite the harsh criticisms of Joh. Eph. He became bishop in 521, cf. Menze 2008a, 119.

36 Lit. 'a bad time had been renewed.'

37 Cf. n.3 above on the execution of Cyrus at the Tetrapylon with Menze 2008a, 115–17. Brooks, PZV ii, 120 n.8, suggests that the remainder of this chapter is a compression of PZ x.3.

38 These details are unique to PZ (i.e. Mich. Syr.).

*in a solemn procession, and he admonished [them], commanding that it be taken down and dragged away, so that, it being despised with insult, because of the insult, God might take pity on him ...*³⁹

a. [The Fourth Chapter of the Tenth Book, in which]⁴⁰ by way of comment, lest anyone go astray in such an iniquity, I write out a section from the letter that was from Rabbula to Gemellinus the bishop of Perîn (Perrhê), concerning those who act wickedly with the mysteries, and are nourished from them as though [they were] mere bread.⁴¹

‘I have heard that in your own place of Perrhê some of the brethren, whose dwellings are not known, as well as others among the renowned heads of

³⁹ The source of this anecdote is unknown.

⁴⁰ This chapter opening is a conjectural text that was offered by Brooks in PZT ii, 178.11–12.

⁴¹ The insertion at this point of this letter (CPG 6493) from Rabbula, bishop of Edessa (412–36), to Gemellinus, bishop of Perrhê in Euphratesia, 30 km northwest of Samosata, is justified by PZ on the grounds of the accusations levelled at Abraham (x.2). On Gemellinus and his see, see Honigmann 1951, 71–2. A shorter fragment of this letter survives independently (including a version in BL Add. 12,155, fol.76^v, cf. Wright 1871, 933), and Brooks, in his edition of PZ, integrates this into PZ’s text on the basis of Mich. Syr.’s fuller text, ix.27 (298–302/224–33, right col.); in the edition of Overbeck 1865, it is instead printed separately (230.1–232.4). On the basis of PD ii, 11/12, where the text originally referred to Paul (bishop of Edessa) as the author of the letter to Gemellinus, it was once ascribed to Paul, the bishop expelled in 519 and then restored (see viii.4). This view was rejected, however, and Chabot emended his text of PD to read Rabbula instead; see further Vööbus 1962, 301–2, Honigmann 1954, 29 n.1, Witakowski 1996a, 12 n.79 on the text. Vööbus 1962, 303–6, brought new evidence to bear: he points to a canon of John of Tella about the problems addressed in this letter that refers explicitly to it. See also Blum 1969, 111. The English text of this translation may be compared with the one established from a critical edition of the Syriac text in Horn and Phenix 2011; see also HB, 301–310. The text of PZ (MS A) has been corrected by Brooks from the text printed in Mich. Syr. Reference is made below to Impr., i.e. the *impressum*, the printed text of Mich. Syr. in Chabot and to the Arabic tr. of Mich. Syr. by Barheb., to be found in MS BL Or. 4402 (cf. PZT i, iv).

Rabbula was an ascetic and heavy-handed Miaphysite bishop of Edessa, about whom Dyophysite sources are highly critical; see (e.g.) Segal 1970, 91–4, Drijvers 1996, 242–4, Drijvers 1997, 305–7. Gemellinus was an ally of Rabbula in the christological disputes of the mid-fifth century; it is clear from the letter that Rabbula is not intending to criticise his colleague. See Blum 1969, 112. The practices that he here condemns, i.e. the reliance on the consecrated bread and wine instead of ordinary food, may well have been prevalent among the ascetics of Gemellinus’ province: the holy man Barsauma was known for his continual fasting (Nau 1913–14, 275) and provoked allegations that he actually did consume wine and meat (Nau 1913–14, 128). See further Honigmann 1954, 29–34, noting that there is nothing implausible in a Miaphysite bishop criticising the practices of a Miaphysite monk: the point at issue was not christological, and loyalties were in any case somewhat uncertain in the 430s.

the monasteries of the place have broadcast about themselves fraudulently a vain reputation, [namely] that they do not eat bread; [they] have applied falsely to themselves a vain boast, [that is] that they do not drink water, and they claim for themselves that they abstain from wine. Therefore I shudder to mention that I have heard that they are acting wickedly with the body and the blood of the Son of God, Jesus, [wanting] to spare the ears of [my] hearers, but because necessity forces me, [and] because it is right I should warn against such [179] a sin, I will boldly say these things which they do without trembling, who madly and without discernment offer the body and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord. This is the holy and sanctifying body that they have received, and the living and life-giving blood that they have drunk. These [people], whom I do not know how⁴² to name,⁴³ impiously satisfy with it the constant, natural need of hunger and thirst, and they are incapable of surviving even one day by their will without the offering, [which is] their nourishment, but rather every day there is a large quantity of food that is supplied from the sacrament. Because of this they even leaven excessively the particle that they prepare, and take care to salt it, and let it rise diligently so that it can become their food, and not the mystery of the body of Christ that is symbolised in the unleavened bread.⁴⁴ Finally, every time they are in short supply, they even offer mere unconsecrated bread upon each other's hands and eat it. Sometimes, when they are travelling from place to place, or are going on an extended journey, two or three times on a single day they satisfy the hunger and thirst of their nature from the same body of our Lord. When they have come to where they are journeying, in the evening they again offer the oblation and take from it as though [they were] fasting; even on the holy days of the Fast of the Forty [Days]⁴⁵ they dare to act in this way without fear of God and without [180] human shame. It has been found

42 Reading with Overbeck *'ekanna* for *hakkana*.

43 Following Overbeck and Arabic; PZT ii, 179, reads 'I do not know of what kind they are.' Rabbula returns to the question of how to designate the objects of his attack at the end of his disquisition; see n.106 below.

44 Blum 1969, 112–13, considers the issue of the bread in detail. Clearly in Rabbula's time it was normal to use unleavened bread in the eucharist, but subsequently this practice fell out of use in the East. Blum therefore suggests, 130–1, that the subsequent section (preserved also in the shorter fragment, translated at HB 305) about the presence of the Holy Spirit in the consecrated bread may have been designed to show that Rabbula's views were in line with Ephraem the Syrian's, despite his differences with the Syrian tradition as regards the use of unleavened bread; see further n.59 below.

45 I.e. Great Lent before Easter (in contrast to the Nativity Lent and the other shorter periods of fasting in the Syrian calendar).

that some individuals, as they say, who forbid themselves⁴⁶ bread and water every day, are eating the sacred bread and drinking the holy wine on such glorious days as those on which even the contemptible abstain.

b. Thus has the spirit that is with me witnessed to me, my holy brother, such that I am trembling to write to your Honour all that I have heard about them, those things which my conscience cannot truly believe. Would it have been possible for you to know those things that I want to teach, without my letter or my word, and for them to receive correction from your Uprightness, because I do not wish that you, my lord, or they, should know what is heard concerning them? Now you should not consider, nor should they think, that I write to you these things concerning them because I believe the evil rumour concerning them. Rather, being in doubt until now, I say even to others that it is not possible that so great a sin as this has been committed on the part of those who have been baptised into Christ. For they say that when they have performed the holy [Eucharist] in the paten, they eat readily from it as much as they want. As for the chalice of the blood, each one of them, when they are able, mixes with it warm water as though it were mixed wine, and drinks it, and again fills it and gives it to his neighbour, so that from the abundance of wine that they drink in the name of the holy [offering] they are often forced to even vomit it out from their mouth.⁴⁷

c. O such exalted impiety as this, if it is so, that the honourable vessels of the holy sanctuary, [181] that even the heavenly rational beings fear to approach because of the mystery that is in them, they boldly made into vessels for the service of their belly, held them in contempt on their lives, and did not remember the punishment that Balshazar the pagan king received, and was reproved.⁴⁸ For he, with the vessels of the service of God, thought to insult God like a rebel, in that he made use of them in a contemptuous way so that the likeness of the palm of a hand that wrote was sent from on high to write on the wall of his house the just sentence for his boldness.⁴⁹ Yet how can the vessels of the service of the temple in Jerusalem compare with the glorious vessels of the service of the body and blood of the Son of God? For also the bread of the presence⁵⁰ of the priests of Israel is not worthy to be compared in any way to the glorious nature of the sublime mystery. If

46 Reading *metkelen* for *akelin*. PZT has *kleyn* (p.p.).

47 As Blum 1969, 115 points out, these criticisms of excessive consumption of wine seem exaggerated. As noted above, however, ascetics did attract hostile reactions.

48 An allusion to Daniel 5.1–6.

49 Reading *marahūta* for *merahmanuta*.

50 Exodus 25.30 *et passim*.

there is anyone who compares the bread of the presence that David ate when he was hungry⁵¹ to the life-giving body of the Son of God, then it is right for us to consider him as a fool who does not distinguish the body and blood of the Lord from the bread of the presence. Because of this he gives offence to the body and blood of our Lord.⁵² For it [the bread of the presence] purified only with difficulty bodily defilement, when combined with various types of ablutions and observances of several [other] things, but this, the life-giving body and blood of our Lord Jesus not only brings forgiveness for the sins of the soul and of the body, sanctifying the faithful who partake of it, but also causes God to be in us, and he through his Spirit, as we are in him through his body: [182] “‘Whoever eats my body and drinks my blood,’ says the son of God, ‘He is in me and I am in him, and I will raise him up on the last day.’”⁵³ Again, in another way we are able to understand the greatness of this new service that has delivered us through God the Word from the harsh and severe punishment that Paul decreed concerning those who abuse it, beyond that which those who transgress the old [covenant] that is from Moses will receive.⁵⁴ For he said, “If it were the case that someone transgress the law of Moses, by the mouth of two or three witnesses he would die without mercy. How much more is he worthy of bitter punishment, who tramples on the Son of God, and has considered the blood of his own covenant as [that] of any person, and despises the spirit of his grace by which we have been sanctified?”⁵⁵ Therefore, this bread of life that came down from heaven,⁵⁶ because of its union with God the Word, gives life to the world: who is there that is so mad as to compare it with the bread of the presence, with its seasoning that is of the earth? Rather, the opinion of one who thinks or acts in this way is known and moreover clearly seen, for anyone who so madly receives it in fact considers it to be mere bread, as he sees it, and does not believe the Son who says, “The bread which I give is my body, that which is given for the life of the world,”⁵⁷ for thus not only is the bread in the body of Christ, as is seen by them, but also in the bread is the body of God⁵⁸ who

51 Cf. 1 Samuel 21.5–6.

52 An allusion to 1 Corinthians 11.27–9, cf. Blum 1969, 116.

53 John 6.54, 56. The omission of 6.55 may be attributed to the fact that it states, ‘My flesh is real food and my blood is real drink’, a formulation that plays into the hands of these ascetics.

54 Omit *’nahnan* ‘we.’

55 Hebrews 10.28–29.

56 John 6.33, and cf. 6.31–58 more generally.

57 John 6.51.

58 Mich. Syr. ix.27 (300c/227) reads ‘Son of God.’

is unseen, as we believe, and we receive the body⁵⁹ *not to satisfy our bellies [183] but to heal our souls.*

d. *For those who with faith eat the bread eat in it and with it the [living] body of God [which sanctifies], but those who eat it without faith receive nourishment only like the rest of those things that are for the use⁶⁰ [of the body]. For if the bread is snatched away by enemies and eaten by force, they eat mere bread, because those who eat it⁶¹ do not have the faith that is aware of its life-force.⁶² For the palate tastes the bread, but faith tastes the power that is hidden within the bread. For we are not kept alive just by the body that is eaten,⁶³ as we said a little earlier;⁶⁴ rather it is the thing that is commingled with it [that gives us life], as we believe. For the power⁶⁵ that is not eaten is commingled with the bread⁶⁶ that is eaten, and becomes⁶⁷ one with those who take it, [just as] the hidden names are associated with the visible waters, and from them a child is born anew. For the Spirit flutters secretly⁶⁸ over the visible waters⁶⁹ in order to regenerate⁷⁰ by them the likeness of the heavenly Adam.⁷¹ And just as in the visible water are hidden the invisible names, in order that all who are baptised in it may partake visibly of the life that is invisible, so also in the visible bread [184] is hidden the concealed power from which everyone who rightly partakes will obtain immortal life. We affirm [the word of]⁷² Paul, that those who receive it carelessly⁷³ obtain from it injury to soul and body and no advantage, even if they are considered*

59 Here a leaf is missing from MS A. Brooks supplied the material from Mich. Syr. ix.27 (300–3c/227–31), supplemented with the shorter fragment of this letter in Overbeck 1865. In this section, the material in brackets indicates phrases omitted from Michael the Syrian. See Blum 1969, 127–30, for a translation and commentary of the section in Overbeck, i.e. up to n.71 below. He argues, however, that it is not the work of Rabbula, but rather the addition of a Syriac writer eager to link him to an interpretation of the Eucharist in line with St Ephraem.

60 Mich. Syr., ‘uses’.

61 Mich. Syr., ‘the mouth that eats it’.

62 Reading with Mich. Syr. ix.27 (300c/227) for *helyuta*, ‘sweetness.’

63 Cf. ‘A person does not live by bread alone, but by every word coming forth from the mouth of God,’ Deuteronomy 8.3; Matthew 4.4, Luke 4.4.

64 Mich. Syr., ‘that we have also already said’.

65 Mich. Syr., ‘the body’.

66 Mich. Syr., ‘with the body’.

67 So also Arabic; Mich. Syr., ‘is’.

68 MS A, ‘the hidden Spirit flutters’.

69 Syr. *mayy glayya*, lit. ‘open waters,’ perhaps a reference to Genesis 1.2.

70 Mich. Syr., ‘engender exactly’ or ‘truly’.

71 Here Overbeck’s extract ends.

72 So Arabic, MS A omits.

73 Impr. *secretly*; Arabic: *bil’istiqa’d* ‘under restriction’.

to be among the believers, but [only] if they are instructed by the word of the apostle who says, "Let a person examine himself, and then let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup; but whoever eats of it when he is not worthy of it eats and drinks condemnation for himself,"⁷⁴ while the same states by his word that it is on account of this contempt for the body and blood that the various infirmities and premature⁷⁵ deaths befall us according to [this] righteous judgment, "By reason of this, many among you are ill and sick, and there are many who suddenly fall asleep. But, if we judged ourselves, we would not be judged. When we are judged by our Lord, we are chastened,⁷⁶ so that we may not be condemned along with the world."⁷⁷ And if those who in the appointed days of service⁷⁸ were now to partake, [even] they would receive only one particle⁷⁹ of the body of life. If it were [the case] that they were to receive [the particle] without suffering, repentance, and not faithfully and with reverent fear, even if they have not also committed an act contrary to their faith, they would be guilty⁸⁰ with respect to the body and the blood of the Lord, as Paul said, because they do not discern the Lord's body.⁸¹ What punishment is harsher than this one, to which the apostle sentenced them, that he should add condemnation of those who approach it without fear, and do not receive what is useful [185] for the faith, but [for] the necessity of their hunger? O such insolence as this for which the divine retribution that punishes⁸² [the offender] is not sufficient! Who does not fear just from hearing that they satisfy the needs of their bodies on that coal of devouring fire, as though it were mere bread? Who is not frightened even to relate how these men eat [to fullness and without] fear of the coal, the foundation of our life,⁸³ that which the seraph revealed to us, grasping it with iron forceps in his hand,⁸⁴ to teach the sublimity of our mystery, and while gazing, looking on with honour, approached to take hold of it? At that body

74 1 Corinthians 11.28–29.

75 Syr. *heṭipa*, lit. 'snatched, seized.'

76 Lit. 'chastened a chastement'.

77 1 Corinthians 2.30–32.

78 Syr. *yawmata p̄rīšē dtešmešta*, a reference to 2 Chronicles 8.14: 'And according to the law of David his father, [Solomon] appointed priests over their functions, and Levites over their responsibilities, to praise and serve before the priests, a fixed number for each day.'

79 Syr. *marganīta*, lit. 'pearl,' a metaphor for a particle of the consecrated Eucharist. See Vööbus 1970, 335 n.9, Yousif 1984, 285–6.

80 Impr.: 'you (pl.) are guilty'; Arabic: omits.

81 1 Corinthians 11.27, 29.

82 Arabic: 'kills'.

83 Impr.: 'That gave our life'; Arabic: 'the medicine of our life'.

84 Cf. Isaiah 6.6.

that was given for the life to come⁸⁵ their heart does not tremble with fear, their hands do not become feeble and weak, and their knees do not shake, when they stoop to eat it for the maintenance of the bodily life. Perhaps it is right for us to say that our Lord also, with his knowledge that searches out all that shall come to pass, knew the deed of these men; and for this reason, after they had eaten and were satisfied from the passover of the Law, then he blessed the bread and gave it to his disciples⁸⁶ in order that these men might not say that, after he had blessed they were satisfied; rather, after they were satisfied, he blessed [it] when the master and his disciples took a small particle of it and over the cup he said, "Take, drink from it all of you,"⁸⁷ so that they might understand⁸⁸ by this that twelve men drank from that little cup.

e. It is necessary to state that they thought they could win the admiration of simple persons because of these [things], abstaining from bread and wine, but they did not understand [186] that the ridicule of the intelligent surpasses⁸⁹ and prevails over them more than the praise of fools like themselves, and will be turned against them. Those who have⁹⁰ accepted glory for themselves for this entirely unpardonable iniquity from mortals, even if they did not [really] acquire it, are not fit to be named men. Rather, they should justly be named 'rabid dogs', for the sign of rabid dogs is this: that they suddenly attack the body of their master in order to eat it.

f. And a man who has cut himself off from bread ought not to taste anything at all until the time appointed for him. And it is well known that when Saul enacted that no one should taste anything on the day of battle until the evening,⁹¹ Jonathan, because he tasted some honey on the end of his staff,⁹² was condemned to death, but was delivered because of the force of the people.⁹³ For "the foundation of a person's life is bread and water,"⁹⁴ says Jesus the son of Simeon Asira;⁹⁵ under the name of bread he extended his

85 Either an allusion to 1 Timothy 4.8, or *de'alma* for *'etîdê*, from John 6.51; Impr. 'the abundant life'; Arabic: *al-hayyât al-muzmi'ah*, 'the forthcoming life'.

86 Matthew 26.26, Mark 14.22, cf. 1 Corinthians 11.25.

87 A paraphrase of Matthew 26.27.

88 So also Arabic; Impr. 'they might be satisfied'.

89 Impr: 'instructs'; Arabic: 'wins'.

90 Reading for Arabic 'He is devoured who has...'

91 1 Samuel 14.24, 28.

92 1 Samuel 14.27.

93 1 Samuel 14.32.

94 Sirach 29:27a (21).

95 That is, Jesus ben Sirach; 'Asira' means 'the Bound One,' identifying him with Simeon

saying to all food. But concerning these men, they say that after they have received the oblation in the daytime, and [have partaken] of it again in the evening, then they eat other food – boiled beets, and they readily [devour seasoned pulses.]⁹⁶ They are said to support themselves with cheese instead of bread, and with fish, and they set out among them all the dishes that they desire. They are greatly sated with delicious fruit, and they delight themselves even more with dried [fruit served] along with honeycombs and egg cakes. And because the heat of the wine that they drink in the name of the holy [offering] inflames their thirst even more, during the whole summer when the milk of sheep [187] or goats is to be found, they drink it regularly *instead of water*, and moreover they plan to do this, knowing from experience that the goodness of the milk and its coolness are able to cool down the constant burning on account of their excess that is from the wine in their stomach. Because of these things and on account of them, in its proper moment it is reported, as though the upright reproof of God were against them, what he did to Eli on account of his sons: “See, I gave you every good thing of the earth, so that you might use them without sin, just as I set apart for them all of the offerings of the house of Israel, so that they should enjoy them blamelessly. Why have you too committed iniquity with my body and my blood, like those who profaned my sacrifices and my offerings?”⁹⁷ Since the crime of these men against God has greatly surpassed the crime of those that was committed among the people, there should be terror and great trembling – if they [feel] suffering – lest the punishment that went out against those [sons of Eli] should also be decreed against these men. Because of this, “Thus says the Lord, the God of Israel, ‘I spoke my word, that your house and the house of your father will serve me forever, but now, says the Lord, far be it from me, for those who honour me I honour, and those who spurn me shall be despised.’”⁹⁸ You see how he excluded them forever from the priesthood, and made them outcasts and foreigners from his house.

g. What shall I say concerning those who do not agree with the prophets of the Old [Testament], let alone [concerning those who] are not conforming to the apostles of the new one? For it is right that they should learn even from the chief of the apostles, [188] Peter, what his food was. For he heard clearly of what bodily life consisted. For when Clement, his chosen disciple, asked him to permit only him to perform his ministry, he said to him thus,

of Luke 2.25. See Coakley 1981.

96 Mich. Syr. ix.27 (303c/231) reads ‘pulses and vegetables.’

97 1 Samuel 2.28–29.

98 1 Samuel 2.30.

while praising his diligence but deriding his diet, “For who is the one who is capable of strength for all of this ministry? Is it not bread and olives that we are regularly eating, even if it happens sometimes that a vegetable turns up?”⁹⁹ Moreover, from Paul, the preacher of truth, they have received a good tradition. For see, even he out of the magnitude of his necessity sent [away] and sold his tunic, [as] it is written, and with its price they bought only bread and brought it to him with a vegetable;¹⁰⁰ this was set down for us too, a law by his deed as well as by his word: “If we have food and clothing, that is enough for us.”¹⁰¹ But if it is insignificant for them to imitate the apostles, the pillars of the world, let them imitate even the master of the apostles, the maker of the worlds and of all that is in them, unless perhaps even the human dispensation of our God is disdained in their eyes and is contemptible. For see, in addition our Lord demonstrates to us that he ate bread everywhere, and that the bread was not even of wheat, but of barley, as were the seven other [loaves] that they produced and were multiplied by his word, and on which four thousand fed and there remained seven baskets filled with bread.¹⁰² And when he ate the Passover with his disciples, unleavened bread was placed before him, and also after the resurrection from the house of the dead, he ate bread with his disciples for forty days¹⁰³, so that the dispensation of our Lord and his bodily incarnation would be believed by them, just as [189] they wrote down: “Jesus entered and went out among them.”¹⁰⁴ And at the house of Cleopas, not wanting them to recognise him while he was travelling with them along the road, he blessed the bread and broke [it] for them in the house, and indeed then they recognised him.¹⁰⁵

99 Pseudo-Clement, *Homilies* 12.6.4 (p.176, p.1448 in the tr.) and Pseudo-Clement, *Recognitiones* 7.6.4 (pp.199–200, p.361 in the tr.), cf. *Die syrische Clementinen*, ed. Frankenberg, pp.292–3. Brooks, PZV ii, 127 n.3, rejects the notion that PZ (or Rabbula) used the Syriac version of this text. Given that we know that one of the Syriac manuscripts of the texts was produced in Edessa in November 411 and that the passages are linguistically fairly close, such a rejection seems unjustified. See Jones 1992, 239 on the manuscript. We are grateful to Dominique Côté for advice on this point.

100 *Acts of Paul (and Thecla)* iii.23 (p.251, p.1136 in the tr.), cf. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, Acta Pauli* 23, 147–8/129–30, although the reference is loose: there is no reference to the vegetable in the *Acta*. The author of the text may have had access to this information either through a written source in Greek or Syriac or perhaps also through an oral tradition.

101 1 Timothy 6.8.

102 Matthew 15.37; Mark 8.8. Rabbula stresses the point that Christ himself consumed bread; if men therefore spurn it, they call into question Christ’s humanity, cf. Blum 1969, 119–21.

103 See Luke 24.30, John 21.13, and Acts 1.3.

104 Acts 1.21.

105 Luke 24.18, 30–32.

h. As I have heard, they do not follow those [who have gone] astray in their deeds, nor do they concur with those who [hold to] the truth by their actions. For they are neither abstemious like the Marcionites, nor are they observant in the likeness of the Christians. For see, they are not like those deniers [of the truth] who eat only dried legumes or bread but do not commit falsehood at their offerings, but neither do they resemble the believers, we who eat mere bread with moderation, and receive with discernment the support of our true life in the consecrated bread.¹⁰⁶

i. Why do they not train themselves, those gluttons whom only insignificant things satisfy? And why have those prodigals not accustomed themselves to loosen the skin of their belly with something mean and ordinary? Why then do they not eat bread that is ordinary, simple, and common? It is clear that it is because they do not want to be afflicted: if they truly wished to afflict their bodies they would not satisfy themselves, but just eat bread. See, although they are wasted away and consumed and weakened, it is evident and known that these [men] do not contend with their bodies, neither do they wrestle with Satan, but instead practise vanity with the schemes of their evil contrivances, and not with the afflictions of asceticism.’ And the rest of the letter, with further demonstrations from the Scriptures.¹⁰⁷

a. [190] The fifth chapter of the tenth book concerns the dedication of the church that Ephraem of Antioch performed and the synod of the bishops under his authority.¹⁰⁸

Ephraem, who was the head of the priests in Antioch, built anew from the foundations in Antioch the church that is rounded in face and the four halls¹⁰⁹ that went out to it.¹¹⁰ After he had performed its dedication, he assembled 132 bishops under his authority in the first [indiction year], and

106 See Blum 1969, 121–2, on Rabbula’s difficulty in categorising the delinquents.

107 PZ omits some of Rabbula’s letter, how much is uncertain. See Blum 1969, 127.

108 Mich. Syr. ix.24 (288b/207–8) follows PZ almost *verbatim* for this chapter.

109 Syr. *tryqln’* < Gk. *triklinos*, meaning (in this context) a hall, as in Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 678, where the word is used several times for halls in the Palace of Hormisdas in Constantinople. We are grateful to Jonathan Bardill for this reference.

110 On Ephraem’s consecration of the new Rotunda church in Antioch see also V. Joh. *ep. Tel.* 90/56–7 with Lebon 1914, 201, Grillmeier 1963, 581–2, Speigl 1994, 145. It was originally the great octagonal church of Constantine, to which four *triklinoi* were now attached; this would then have made a cruciform building, assuming the *triklinoi* (halls, cf. n.109) projected from alternate sides, as at the *martyrium* of St Symeon at Qal’at Sem’an (on which see, e.g., Sodini and Biscop 1983). See Downey 1961, 342–50 on Constantine’s church, 533 on its rebuilding by Ephraem in the wake of the earthquake of 528, *ibid.* for archaeological evidence for other building projects, including a bath, undertaken at this time.

each one of the soldiers who [were present] at the dedication of the church he received as he wished with an overflowing hand, and he confirmed the Council of Chalcedon in writing, which the bishops whom he had assembled demanded. They condemned the holy and believing Patriarch Severus and all those who agreed with him in not accepting the Council [of Chalcedon].¹¹¹ After a short while God, who renders judgment for those who are wronged, stirred up against them and against the city the Assyrians, according to the word of the prophet who said, ‘The Assyrians are the rod of my anger, and the staff of my scourge. I will send it against the impious people, and I will command it against the malicious people to exile them and despoil them.’ After two years, in [indiction year] three, Khusro went up against Antioch, as is written in the following chapter.¹¹²

Chapter Six [lost].

a. [191] Fragments of Chapters Six through Eight¹¹³

In the eleventh year of Justinian, which is the year 850 of the Greeks,¹¹⁴ in the month of *Kanun*,¹¹⁵ a great and fearsome comet appeared in the sky¹¹⁶ in the evening [for] many days,¹¹⁷ and in that year peace between the empires

111 Lebon 1914, 201, suggests that PZ is here referring to the synod that examined the case of Synceticus, metropolitan of Tarsus, and his *syncellus* Stephen, who were suspected of being Eutychians; the bishop was obliged to adhere to the Chalcedonian faith. Cf. Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 228, pp.120–1 and 123–4 (on the synod) with Honigmann 1951, 166. Indiction year 1 is 537/8.

112 PZ’s characterisation of Khusro’s invasion of 540 as divine vengeance on the Chalcedonians is unsurprising; the quotation is from Isaiah 10.5–6. Indiction year 3 is 539/40. Cf. PZ vii.6a for a similar allusion to the Assyrians in the context of a Persian invasion. Antioch fell in June 540, cf. Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 104–5 with n.4 above.

113 This section is reconstructed by Brooks on the basis of Mich. Syr. ix.24 (287/205–6a), Barheb. *Chr.* 79/74, Jac. Ede. *Chron.* 320/242. HB 312 added a section from Jac. Ede., which is more likely to be derived from Joh. Eph. than PZ, since its dating of Khusro’s invasion is inconsistent and does not use the indiction year: see PZT ii, 191 n.1. We have nevertheless translated this section immediately below: it covers only three lines, as far as ‘Khusro’.

114 A.D. 538–539. The date is one year too early, however, since this must be the comet of late 539 mentioned also by Proc. (see n.117 below). On its dating see Kislinger and Stathakopoulos 1999, 78 and n.10, Kronk 1999, 88–90, Meier 2003a, 307; cf. the far eastern sources in Ho 1962, 165 no.221, Hasegawa, 333 no.70 (placing it in late November or early December 539).

115 The month name is given only in Jacob of Edessa, and corresponds to December (First Kanun) or January (Second Kanun), the text does not indicate which Kanun.

116 Only in Jac. Ede.: see HB 312.

117 So Mich. Syr.; Jac. Ede. reads: ‘for a hundred days’. Proc. *Wars* ii.4.1–2 describes this same comet, noting that it was seen for forty days and was regarded as presaging ill for the Roman Empire. See further Meier 2003a, 662 and n.55 (noting other attestations).

was broken, because Khusro, king of the Persians, went up and took away captives from the city of Sura; and Antioch, Aleppo (Beroea), Apamea, and their regions [he subjected to] a bitter captivity. Then the Romans went down to the Euphrates and captured the regions of the Cardonians, Arzanians, and Arabs.¹¹⁸

b. Then Khusro went up with a large army and captured Callinicum and the entire region of *the southern part of*¹¹⁹ Upper Mesopotamia, and then returned.¹²⁰

A fragment of Chapter Nine¹²¹

a. Moreover Zachariah Rhetor wrote this concerning the plague as follows.¹²² As it is said in Ezekiel, the prophet, in Syriac, that ‘every knee will gush water’, and in Greek it is written, ‘Every upper back thigh will be defiled with pus.’¹²³ He says this on account of the spots of plague, and this plague of purulent tumors with swellings in the groin, [and] of spots of plague in the thighs and the armpits [**192**] of human beings,¹²⁴ spread out from Kush that is on the border of Egypt, and from Alexandria, Libya, Palestine, Phoenicia, Arabia, Byzantium, Italy, Africa, Sicily, and Gaul, and arrived in Galatia, Cappadocia, Armenia, Antioch, Osroene, Mesopotamia,

118 On the Persian invasion see n.4 above. For the Roman counter-attack here noted, see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 108–9 and 271 n.36: the strike(s) referred to took place in 541. The reference to Cardonians must be to the region of Corduene, south-east of Arzanene (the second region referred to by PZ).

119 This phrase is provided from Jacob of Edessa.

120 On the Persian capture of Callinicum in 542 see n.6 above. Only Jac. Ede. *Chr.* 320/242 has ‘southern’.

121 Supplied from Mich. Syr. ix.28 (307–8c/240).

122 The Justinianic plague, which started in Egypt in 541 and reached Constantinople in the following year, is recounted in great detail by PD ii, 79–109/74–98, cf. Proc. *Wars* ii.22–3. It has been the subject of numerous studies recently: see (e.g.) Stathakopoulos 2000, Meier 2003a, 319–37, Stathakopoulos 2004, nos.102–12, 114–18, Horden 2005, Little 2007, sections I–III, esp. Morony 2007, 61. For a brief overview, see Evans 1996, 160–6.

123 Ezekiel 7.17, where the Syriac word *mayyê* ‘water’ corresponds to Hebrew *mâyim* ‘water’ and the Greek *hygrasia* ‘moisture.’ The word ‘knee’ is found in Hebrew and Syriac; the Greek word ‘upper back thigh (the ham)’ is *mêlos*; this word only makes sense in the context of ‘defiled with moisture’ if it is a metaphor for the (male) genitals. The Syriac translation of the word *hygrasia* here is *mugla*, which is itself a borrowing from Medieval Greek *moukhla*. This would suggest that this passage may be a later interpolation. It also means that the interpolator understood the metaphor of the Greek *mêlos* and emphasised that it was not simply a liquid that ‘defiled’, but an infectious discharge from the penis or possibly from the scrotum. We are grateful to William Kinkaid, MD, MPH and Marilyn Kinkaid, MD, for the identification of the connotation of *mêlos* as well as for discussion of the passage.

124 On these symptoms see PD ii, 95/87, Proc. *Wars* ii.22.16–17, Horden 2005, 139–46.

and eventually the territory of the Persians, and the nations of the North-east, devastating them.¹²⁵ Those who were struck with the scourge, and who happened to escape and not die, trembled and were shaking, and it was known that the scourge was from Satan, who received permission from God to discipline human beings.¹²⁶ In the city of Homs (Emesa) was the head of John the Baptist, and many took refuge there and were saved, and the demons were howling in the mouths of human beings while crying out because of the holy man.¹²⁷

Fragments of Chapters Ten and Eleven.¹²⁸

a. *The Romans went down [with an army] and wrought much destruction in the territory of the Armenians.*¹²⁹

b. Then Khusrō went up and made an attack¹³⁰ against Edessa, but when he was not able to capture it, he took captives from Batnae and then departed. There was no one who raised his voice [even] to chirp, as it is written.¹³¹

[193] A fragment of Chapter Twelve.¹³²

125 See Horden 2005, 134–9, on the spread of the plague. Kush refers to the region south of Egypt.

126 Justinian was among those who was struck by the plague, *Proc. Wars* ii.23.20. See also *Proc. Wars* ii.22.37–9 on survivors.

127 The full story of the discovery of John's head and its arrival in Emesa, where it languished in a cave for years before being rediscovered in February 453 is recounted by *Marc. com.* a.453.1, cf. *Chr. Pasch.* 591.7–12 and the accounts in *PL* 67, 430–44 (one of which was translated into Latin in the sixth century by Dionysius Exiguus) with the comments of Croke 1995, 91–2. PZ's reference here is usually overlooked in the secondary literature, but shows that it was still to be found in Emesa nearly a century later. A rival tradition (see *Soz. HE* vii.21 with the notes of Angliviel de la Baumelle and Sabbah 2008, 178) held that the head arrived rather in Constantinople during the reign of Theodosius I.

128 The two brief fragments are assembled from *Mich. Syr.* ix.29 (309/244b), cf. Barheb. *Chr.* 79/74, *Jac. Ede. Chr.* 321/242–3.

129 A rather exaggerated reference to the campaign of 542 or 543, on which see n.7 above. This sentence is only found in Jacob of Edessa.

130 This clause is only in Jacob of Edessa.

131 On Khusrō's invasion of 543 (or 544) see n.8 above. An attack on Batnae (as well as Edessa) is also mentioned by the *Spurious Life of Jacob Baradaeus*, *PO* 19 (1925), 262–4: see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 272 n.57. Batnae was often an easy target, cf. *Ps.-Josh.* 63 with Greatrex 1998, 106, although its walls were repaired in 505, *Ps.-Josh.* 89 with Greatrex 1998, 115.

132 As HB 314 n.2 point out, this passage can with reasonable certainty be attributed to PZ, partly on the grounds that *Mich. Syr.* did not derive it from PD, but more importantly because it uses the dating system that PZ favours, an indiction year given in Greek. It is drawn from *Mich. Syr.* ix.29 (309–10c/244–5); Chabot, *ibid.*, also states that he considers the passage to be drawn from PZ.

a. As through from necessity, and the lack of pastors for the country of the Persians, one Cyrus, who was a believing bishop, blessed and made priests from the first [indiction year] until this eighth [indiction year].¹³³ So that the heads of the bodies of the faithful should not have any blame, or [so] that those who became priests in Persian territory should not be defamed by those who were opponents and danger befall them, they were rightly moved by zeal and reasoned correctly,¹³⁴ and they blessed and appointed bishops in Arabia: Theodore the monk, a diligent man who was found in the imperial city, and the energetic and indefatigable Jacob, who was very valiant and was found in every place assiduously working and exhorting.¹³⁵ He was an austere man of renunciation, but quick on his feet, and he walked like Asael.¹³⁶ He was a priest in the Monastery of the Stone Quarry, from the village of Ga'mwa

133 The situation of the anti-Chalcedonians of the East was precarious indeed following the deaths of Severus and John of Tella in 538, cf. Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 522, 529, 691–2, who confirms the dearth of bishops and the presence of one bishop across the frontier in Persia. This must be PZ's Cyrus, who is otherwise not attested by name, save in Barheb. CE 217/18 (where his name is given as Qaris, cf. CE vol.3, 87/8), who states that he was bishop of Singara. Fiey 1977, 128, notes that there was a Nestorian bishop at Singara from 533 and Peeters 1926, 284–5 is sceptical of Cyrus' existence. See Menze 2008a, ch.4, on the difficulties posed to the anti-Chalcedonians by the lack of clergy, which deprived communities of the Eucharist and of the possibility of baptising people into the anti-Chalcedonian faith.

134 This sentence is probably corrupted; HB translated, 'And, lest the heads of the communities of believers should be blamed, or because the priests who were among the Persians belonged to the opposite party, and they were assailed by affliction and trouble, they procured provisions ...'

135 In Mich. Syr. this clause describes Theodore, but after it is a gloss, 'This is my lord Jacob Burd'ono (Baradaeus).' Barheb. then inserts, 'and they ordained him ecumenical metropolitan.' See HB 314. The consecration of Jacob Baradaeus and Theodore as bishops of Edessa and Bostra respectively took place in 542. It was a decisive step for the anti-Chalcedonian community, since Jacob in particular proved extremely active, as PZ describes, in ordaining clergy and in building up a rival church hierarchy; he ranged far and wide throughout his episcopacy, from 542 to his death in 578. According to John of Ephesus, the Jafnid chief Harith appealed to Theodora to organise these nominations: see Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 153–4, *Spurious Life of Jacob Baradaeus*, PO 19 (1925), 238–9 with Stein 1949, 624–5, Frend 1972, 284–7, Bundy 1978, esp.61–3 on the evidence of PZ (although he doubts that the passage can be ascribed to PZ), Shahîd 1995, 755–7, 771–3. PZ is incorrect in stating that both were made bishops in Arabia. According to Joh. Eph., *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 691–2, Jacob had been in Constantinople for fifteen years before his ordination. Whether the patriarch Theodosius performed the ordination is uncertain, although probable: see Bundy 1978, 79.

136 Cf. 2 Samuel 2.18.

which was in the Tur Izla,¹³⁷ and with the deposit¹³⁸ that had been entrusted to him, he saved many from the territory of the Persians.

Fragments of Chapters Thirteen and Fourteen.¹³⁹

a. Then Khusro the king of the Persians went up and took exiles from Petra, the city of the Lazicans, and appointed a garrison there, and from this time¹⁴⁰ the Romans were engaged in war [194] against it for seven years. Then the Persians were defeated and the Romans recaptured it.¹⁴¹

b. At that time there was a shortage of grain and a scarcity of [all] sorts of vegetables in the entire region of the East in the ninth [indiction year], and it created a hunger in soul and in body, and following it there was the plague.¹⁴² There befell human beings the suffering of bulimia, which is the bovine hunger. For a person ate ten pounds of bread at a time with vegetables, ravenously and with hunger, and though he became heavy and bloated from eating, he was not satiated, but was hungry and ravenous, and would ask for bread though his stomach was full, and thus he would die.¹⁴³

137 Barheb. adds, 'and he began to go about the territories of the East and give ordination to the orthodox, appearing in the clothing of a beggar, mainly on the roads for fear of the persecution [of anti-Chalcedonians].' The monastery is called in Syr. *psylt*: see PZ viii n.111 with Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 692, on Jacob's origins. Tur Izla (Mt Izla) is part of Tur Abdin, just north of Dara.

138 Syr. *p'rttyqy* < Gk. *parathêkê*.

139 These fragments are reconstructed on the basis of Mich. Syr. ix.29 (309b/244–5), cf. Barheb. *Chr.* 81/76, Jac. Ede. *Chr.* 321/243.

140 Lit. 'from now.'

141 Khusro captured Petra in 541: see Proc. *Wars* ii.17 with Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 115–16. While an attempt was made to retake the city in 548, it was not until 551 that it was finally recaptured: see Proc. *Wars* viii.11–12, Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 118–19. Proc. *Wars* ii.28.30 refers to a deportation planned by Khusro, although doubt has been cast on his claim: see Boerm 2007, 176 and n.3 for a detailed discussion of this passage and Morony 2004, 173–4, on deportations generally in the 540s.

142 Cf. PD ii, 119/107: 'In the year 858 (546/7) famine began to appear and continued for eight years until the year 866 (554/5)' (tr. Witakowski), cf. 114/103, Mal. 18.95 (noting a wine shortage) with Meier 2003a, 664. The reference to the plague is no doubt to one of the many recurrences of the pandemic (n.122 above). See also Telelis 2004, no.156, Stathakopoulos 2004, no.125.

143 This phenomenon was well known in the ancient world: Totila allowed the inhabitants of Naples to increase their food intake only gradually after he took the city in spring 543 (see Stein 1949, 575), Proc. *Wars* vii.8.1–4, knowing that otherwise they would gorge themselves and perish in the manner described by PZ here. Cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v.549, where Jewish defectors over-eat after joining the Romans and die as a consequence.

c. After¹⁴⁴ *this there was a plague among oxen in all countries, particularly in the East, and it lasted two years until the lands remained untilled for lack of oxen.*

a. Chapter Fifteen, concerning the sack of Rome, which the barbarians seized and plundered in the days of Justinian ...¹⁴⁵

*'... and so that you should know how much damage there was to the property of the Romans during the capture, see, I have written a description of it, and even if in brief, [it is written] by someone who was aware of it and was a spectator of its buildings.'*¹⁴⁶

b. In the third [year] of the siege of the city of Ilium which was ruined in the days of Samson and of Eli the priest who was in Jerusalem, kings began to arise in the city of Rome which had earlier been called Italy, and the kings who reigned in it were called [kings] of the Latins. In the days of Jotham and Ahaz [195] kings of Judah, Romulus ruled in [Rome], and he built in the city great and famous buildings, and it was called Rome after his name,¹⁴⁷ and the kingdom of its inhabitants was called [the kingdom] of the

144 HB 315 were more ambitious than Brooks in PZT in reconstructing PZ here, inserting this brief paragraph from Mich. Syr. ix.29 (309b/245) and Jac. Ede. Chr. 321/243; because it does not appear in PZT ii, 194, we have italicised it. Clearly the report is linked to the information immediately above; see Farquharson 1996, 267, Telelis 2004, no.156.

145 In Mich. Syr. ix.29 (308a/241) there is a brief section before the passage in italics we have translated (following Brooks' edition): 'In the year eighteen of Justinian, that is the year 857 of the Greeks, the Huns [emending to *hwny* with Chabot for MS *rwmy*]; HB emend to 'barbarians'] took Rome, the chief city of Italy; and since they could not guard it, they resided in the camp along side it, but they left it [the city] deserted and empty.' The reference is either to Totila's capture of Rome in December 546 or Belisarius' recapture of it in April 547, most probably the former, since Proc. Wars vii.22.18–19 describes how Totila encamped outside the city, having captured it, and then forced the city's evacuation. See Stein 1949, 584–6.

146 Reconstructed from Mich. Syr. ix.29 (308a/241). The person involved may well be the Dominic referred to at ix.18, cf. Prostko-Prostyński 1993, 20 n.38.

147 Mich. Syr. offers comparable details at various points in his chronicle. At iv.16 (49/81–2) he notes that the first kings ruled in Italy three years after the fall of Troy, Aeneas being the first; he states that this took place in the time of Labdon, the judge of Israel, however (rather than Samson and Eli), cf. iv.6 (33/55–6), where the first year of the Latin kings is placed in the seventh year of Labdon. The table of judges further down on the same page appears to synchronise Labdon with Eli, however. On the other hand, in iv.7 (33/56) he offers the same synchronism as PZ here (cf. Mich. Syr. ix.29 [308c/241]): Samson's reign corresponds to the period of the fall of Troy and the years following. The synchronism goes back at least as far as Jerome, *Chron.* 62^{a-b}. The second synchronism is also to be found in the same passages of Mich. Syr., although at iv.16 (49/82) he refers just to Ahaz, 'king of Judah', rather than to both Jotham and Ahaz. Cf. Jerome *Chron.* 88^b, where Romulus' reign is synchronised with the sixth year

Romans since the time of King Hezekiah.¹⁴⁸

a. Chapter Sixteen, concerning the ornaments and buildings that are in the city of Rome.¹⁴⁹

of Ahaz in Judah and Hosea in Israel. Debié 2004a, 153 n.35, notes that the same synchronism can be found in *Chr.* 846, 162/126 and *Chr.* 1234, 109/86. Gelzer 1880, 169–73, traces this synchronism back to Julius Africanus.

148 Cf. Jerome *Chron.* 90^a, where the thirteenth year of Hezekiah's reign is synchronised with the moment from which the Romans were called Quirites. This last element seems to have dropped out from PZ. Mich. Syr. ix.29 (309/241a) offers the same synchronisation.

Debié 2004a, 154, argues that in the missing portions of this chapter PZ drew on Mal. 7.1–2 (and perhaps following chapters) to narrate the history of the city (as the title of the chapter promises). To support her point, she notes that *Chr.* 1234, 110/86–7, contains an abbreviated form of the catalogue of buildings in Rome (PZ x.16 below), following an account of Romulus' life derived from Malalas; Mich. Syr. iv.16 (47–8/80–5) likewise gives details of Romulus' life, comparable to those in Mal., both before and after the catalogue. However, given that, as she notes, Syriac accounts of Romulus circulated independently of PZ (*ibid.* 150–1), it is not necessary to postulate the inclusion of such material in PZ.

149 A comparable register of the noteworthy buildings of Rome, derived from that given here by PZ, is offered in two locations by Mich. Syr., first at iv.6 (49–50/81–2), in the context of the city's foundation, then at ix.29 (308–10/241–3), in the same context as that in which PZ gives his, i.e. the capture of the city by Totila in December 546. MS A gives a much abbreviated list: for a translation (into Italian) see Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 334; there is also an abbreviated list in *Chr.* 1234, 110–11/87, no doubt based on Mich. Syr. MS C, on the other hand, is more complete here. PZ's catalogue is probably based on a Greek version of the appendix (or *breviarium*, as it is called in the text) that concludes the works now known as the *Notitia Urbis Romae* and the *Curiosum*, both of which date from the fourth century and are edited by Nordh 1949. In general on these works see Behrwald 2009, 185–200 and his article of 2006. On the dating of the works see Chastagnol 1996, 183–4, Arce 1999, 22, Storey 2002, 412, Behrwald 2006, 748–51: the *Notitia* probably precedes the *Curiosum*. Both may well go back to much earlier documents, since they refer to buildings no longer used and pass over subsequent constructions, see Chastagnol 1996, 187–9, Arce 1999, 19, 22. Although some scholars have considered these catalogues to have been official documents (so Chastagnol 1996, 185), Arce 1999 (cf. Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 323–4, Behrwald 2006, 744–7) argues convincingly that they are more likely to have been private documents, commissioned to highlight the wonders of the city; it is not necessary, however, to suppose that they are baseless fictions of a purely panegyric nature, cf. Behrwald 2006, 747–8. Such catalogues were thus somewhat idiosyncratic in nature and, although they probably used some sort of public list as a basis for their accounts (cf. Storey 2002, 413, Behrwald 2006, 757–8), variable in their content: one might choose to develop a particular section, adding more details, while another might prefer to omit certain elements. Jordan 1871, 152, 575–8, argues that PZ's catalogue goes back to an annotated expansion of the appendices of the *Notitia* and the *Curiosum* in Greek; the same source, according to his reconstruction, lies behind Olympiodorus frg.41.1, cf. Guidi 1881, 237 n.1, Arce 1999, 20. See also Nordh 1949, 42–5 and Jordan 1871, 152, noting how PZ's version is often in agreement with recension β, the manuscript tradition in which both the *Curiosum* and the *Notitia* are preserved.

The account of the decorations of the city in brief is as follows, concerning their opulence and concerning their great and rich culture, their luxuries and their noble and stately amenities, such as are in a large city of wondrous appearance. Such is the magnitude of its decoration, not including the beauty that is within its houses,¹⁵⁰ and the architecture of the columns, of their courts, of their colonnades,¹⁵¹ of their steps, and their height, that are in that city of wondrous appearance.

b. Within it are:

- (i) 24 churches of the blessed apostles¹⁵² of the *katholikon* church;¹⁵³

A comparable catalogue exists for Alexandria, preserved in Mich. Syr. v.3 (72–3/113–15), on which see Fraser 1951, who considers it to be based on an official document; Arce's interpretation, however, is preferable. There is also the *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae*, edited by Seeck, *Notitia Dignitatum*, 227–43, which dates from the reign of Theodosius II, cf. Kazhdan in *ODB* iii, 1496–7. Like PZ's list, this catalogue begins with the churches of the city and ends with the city's dimensions. Its author was influenced by the descriptions of Rome, which may indicate the spread of the *Curiosum* and *Notitia* to the East; the *breviarium* upon which PZ draws may in turn have been amended in order to bring it into line with the description of Constantinople, which would explain the mention of churches at the start and the dimensions of the city at the end. We are indebted to Franz Alto Bauer and Ralf Behrwald for discussion of this section.

Chr. 1234, 111–12/88, following the abbreviated version of PZ's catalogue, goes on to relate details about how a letter of the Emperor Antoninus (Pius, presumably) to the Antiochenes established the relative sizes of the cities of the empire, in which Rome was first, Alexandria second, and then discusses the various wonders of the world, cf. Mich. Syr. v.3 (72/113) on the relative sizes, after which he gives his catalogue of the buildings of Alexandria. It is possible that a compendium, undoubtedly in Syriac by the time of these two late sources, drew together all sorts of miscellaneous information on the wonders of the cities of the empire. PZ confined himself to using the information on Rome; later sources exploited it more fully.

The commentary below is not exhaustive; we do not note all the variations between MSS A and C of PZ, and the two versions in Mich. Syr. For such detail see Guidi 1881, 1894 and Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 330–4.

150 For comparable praise of the splendour of Rome's houses see Olympiodorus frg.41.1 with Matthews 1975, 383–4, Ammianus xvi.10. Cf. Arce 1999, 20.

151 Brooks reads *proasteion* (PZV ii, 132 and n.2) which he prefers to the emendation of *peristyla* proposed by Guidi 1884, 226–7, i.e. colonnades. We prefer Guidi's emendation, however, cf. Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 330 n.4.

152 The *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* likewise gives a figure for the number of churches at the outset (242.22). In the *Notitia* and the *Curiosum*, on the other hand, there is no reference to Christian buildings. Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 323, link the 24 churches with the 25 *tituli* mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis*, which were said to go back to apostolic times, cf. Krautheimer 1980, 18; this is unlikely, however, since this work never circulated in the East, and there is no actual list of the *tituli* in it. Jordan 1871, 150, notes that a distinct *Notitia ecclesiarum* emerged over the sixth and seventh centuries, which lists twenty churches. See also Krautheimer 1980, ch.2, with fig.28 (p.32), on the churches of Rome in this period.

153 The reference to Catholic (Gk. *katholikos*) churches might imply that this part was

- (ii) two vast basilicas where the emperor takes his seat and the senators assemble daily before him;¹⁵⁴
- (iii) 324 broad and long streets;¹⁵⁵
- (iv) two vast capitols;¹⁵⁶
- (v) 80 [statues of] gods of gold;
- (vi) 64 [statues of] gods of ivory;¹⁵⁷ [196]
- (vii) 46,603 residential dwellings;¹⁵⁸
- (viii) 1797 houses of nobles;¹⁵⁹
- (ix) 1352 reservoirs distributing water;¹⁶⁰
- (x) 274 bakers who constantly make and give *annona*e for the inhabitants of the city, besides those who make and sell [bread] in the city;¹⁶¹

composed under Arian Ostrogothic rule, even if Theoderic (and his successors) rarely visited the city, cf. Moorhead 1992, 143. Guidi 1884, 237–8, on the other hand argues that the reference in (ii) to the senators assembling before the king - he suggests a reference to the *praefectus urbi* - indicates the foreign provenance of the catalogue, contaminated with legends.

154 Two basilicas seems a low figure: although the appendices of the *Notitia* and *Curiosum* do not give a figure for the number of basilicas, the summary that precedes the appendix lists 10, ed. Nordh 1949, 100.4–14. Polemius Silvius, whose *Laterculus* dates from 449 and includes a very brief list of the monuments of Rome (based on the *breviarium* and edited by Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 308–10), lists 11 basilicas (309.4–5). It is likely that the initial figure in XI was mistaken for an I, thus yielding II (2).

155 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum*, 104.17, which both give 424; Polemius, 310.6, also has 424.

156 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.1. These two works refer earlier to a *capitolium antiquum* in the sixth region, 81.8, and the well-known *capitolium* in the heart of the city, 85.1. See *LTUR* i, 226–34.

157 No other source documents this data. The figures are viewed with suspicion, probably rightly, by Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 323–4. Given that these statues will not have survived until the sixth century, it is likely that they represent a legendary accretion, added by a source not acquainted with the city, cf. Guidi 1884, 238. Jordan 1871, 46–7, is prepared to believe that the information derives from a reliable source.

158 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.2–3 who have 46,602 *insulae*. The translation of this term remains controversial, i.e. whether it refers to a block, the floor of a building, or indeed just an apartment. Chastagnol 1996, 186, prefers the last interpretation, but the discussion which follows his paper, 193–6, shows that there is as yet no consensus. Hermansen 1978, 166–7, casts doubt on the reliability of this figure, although it is accepted by most scholars. See most recently Storey 2002, esp. 430–1, concluding that the term refers not to a separate structure, but to a unit within a building.

159 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.4 who have 1790.

160 PZ uses the Greek *kanalês* for reservoir, the equivalent of the *lacos* referred to by *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.7–8, who also have the figure of 1352. See Jones 1964, 696.

161 *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.9 offer the figure of 254. PZ offers more precision than these sources, however, drawing a distinction between the government bakers, under the authority of the *praefectus annonae*, responsible for the free distributions of bread, and the other bakers who simply sold it to the public. Bread distributions continued up until the reign of Theoderic.

- (xi) 5000 cemeteries where they gather and bury [the dead];¹⁶²
- (xii) 31 large pedestals of white marble;¹⁶³
- (xiii) 3785 bronze statues of emperors and commanders;¹⁶⁴
- (xiv) 25 bronze statues of Abraham, Sarah, Hagar, and of the kings of the house of David, which Emperor Vespasian erected when he destroyed Jerusalem, and the gates of Jerusalem and other bronze objects;¹⁶⁵
- (xv) two colossal statues;¹⁶⁶
- (xvi) two spiral columns;¹⁶⁷
- (xvii) two circuses;¹⁶⁸ [197]
- (xviii) two theatres and one;¹⁶⁹
- (xix) two amphitheatres;¹⁷⁰
- (xx) [three [places for] combat with wild beasts];¹⁷¹

See Guidi 1884, 227–8 and Jones 1964, 699–701, for details.

162 Cf. Polemius' *innumerae cellulae martyrum* (innumerable repositories of martyrs), 310.9, noted by Jordan 1871, 150; see also Pietri 1976, 607–17. The reference must be to tombs in the catacombs of the city, cf. Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 331 n.12. We translate PZ's *knshyn* as 'gather', taking it as a reference to the frequent gatherings held in cemeteries: so Guidi 1884, 228, Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 331 n.12.

163 Cf. the 36 *arci marmorei* in *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.15. The Syriac *bsys* could be from the Greek *baseis*, although Fraenkel 1902, 100, suggested *psalides* ('column mouldings').

164 Mich. Syr. iv.16 (49/82) says that there were 3800 bronze statues of men and 270 of kings, which implies that he was not merely deriving his information directly from PZ. Jordan 1871, 150, cf. 47, believed that these last two entries were derived from a fuller version of the *Curiosum*. See Krautheimer 1980, 37–8, on the statues in Rome admired by Procopius in the 530s with Proc. *Wars* viii.21.12–14 and Cassiodorus, *ep.* 7.13.1.

165 These are referred to in no other account and are generally regarded as the invention of a non-Roman source, so Jordan 1871, 149, Guidi 1884, 238. At least some of the items seized by Vespasian from Jerusalem had subsequently been plundered by the Vandals and taken to Carthage in 455: see PZ ix n.259.

166 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.5, who have the same figure. Jordan 1871, 45, notes that only one is known, that of Helios, the sun-god, cf. *LTUR* i, 295–8.

167 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.6, the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius.

168 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.3, oddly omitted by Valentini and Zucchetti 332. The reference is to the Circus Flaminius and the Circus Maximus.

169 So MS V; Mich. Syr. ix.29 (310a/242) and MS C have 'three theatres', cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.8, but it is just possible that a phrase is missing after 'one'.

170 The Syriac has 'wry', which Guidi 1884, 228–9, suggests is a rendering of the Greek *theōria*; C has *kynēgia*, the Greek equivalent of an amphitheatre. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.4 also have two. They are the Flavian amphitheatre (the Colosseum), 76.9–10 and the *amphitheatrum castrense* in the fifth region, 80.6 (on which see *LTUR* i, 35–6).

171 PZ uses the Gk. *kynēgia*; this is the reading of MS C, cf. preceding note. As Brooks, PZV ii, 133 n.3 notes, either this entry or the preceding one must be dropped. We therefore bracket this one.

- (xxi) four gladiator schools;¹⁷²
- (xxii) eleven *nymphaea*;¹⁷³
- (xxiii) 22 large and mighty bronze horses;¹⁷⁴
- (xxiv) 926 baths;¹⁷⁵
- (xxv) four cohorts of *vigiles*;¹⁷⁶
- (xxvi) among whom [there are] fourteen excubitors;¹⁷⁷
- (xxvii) two camps¹⁷⁸ of single bronze horses;¹⁷⁹
- (xxviii) 45 brothels;¹⁸⁰
- (xxix) 2300 public stores of oil;¹⁸¹

172 The reference is to *ludi*, i.e. schools of gladiators: see Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 332 n.7. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.9 offer the same figure. Cf. *LTUR* iii, 195–8; 4 *ludi* were founded by Diocletian.

173 For this reading of the Syriac 'mpy'; see Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 332 n.8, Guidi 1881, 230, cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.11, according to whom there were 15. Fewer are noted in *LTUR* iii, 351–3.

174 The *equi magni* of *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.12, of which there are also said to be 22. On the reading 'bronze' see Guidi 1884, 230–1. According to Jordan 1871, 46, both statues and groups of statues are meant. See *LTUR* ii, 224–33.

175 Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.6, who have 856, although some manuscripts have 956.

176 The Syriac is 'rbylyqwn, which (cf. PZV ii, 133 n.7) appears to be a garbling of these Latin terms. Cf. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.15, but where the figure is 7. Guidi 1884, 231–2, believes that the text might be emended here to read 7; alternatively, as he states, there may be a confusion with the urban cohorts, of whom, according to *Notitia* and *Curiosum* (105.14) there were 4. See also Valentini and Zucchetti 332 n.11, *LTUR* i, 292–4.

177 Syr. 'nqptwrywn. See Glossary for the term. See Guidi 1884, 231–2 and Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 332 n.12 on the corruptions that were introduced into the text in the transition from Latin to Greek then Syriac. For the figure see *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.15–16, which also have 14.

178 Syr. *prymbwl* < Gk. *parembolai*.

179 A garbling of a reference to two camps of *equites singulares*, i.e. a unit of cavalry. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 106.1 refer to only one such camp, although one manuscript has two. See Guidi 1884, 232. The camps are the *priora* and *nova Severiana*, see Jordan 1871, 71–2, *LTUR* i, 246–8.

180 PZ uses a Syriacisation (*sistrê*) of the obscure Greek word *seistra* here, which Fraenkel 1902, 99, shows to mean 'brothel', cf. Socr. *HE* v.18.11 (referring to the brothels in Rome specifically for women found guilty of adultery, using this term). *Notitia* and *Curiosum* give a figure of 46. See also Jordan 1871, 69–70.

181 A reference to the *mensae oleareae* (oil tables) of the *Notitia* and *Curiosum*, 106.9–10, who also have the figure 2300; these warehouses were for stocking the oil once it arrived from overseas, see Jones 1964, 701. We follow the emendation of Fraenkel 1902, 100, to read *ptwr*, i.e. table (rather than the *apothecaria* of Brooks), cf. Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 333 n.4. As Behrwald 2006, 755–6, points out, the oil stores were not included in the main *Notitia* but only in the *Breviarium*, which implies that they were a later addition following the introduction of oil distributions in the Severan period.

(xxx) 291 depots;¹⁸²

(xxxi) 254 public latrines in the neighbourhoods;¹⁸³ [198]

(xxxii) 673 eparchs who guard the city, with seven people in charge of them all.¹⁸⁴

The gates of the city are 37.¹⁸⁵ The entire circumference of the city is 216,030 paces, which constitute forty miles. The distance within the city from east to west is twelve miles, and from north to south, twelve miles.¹⁸⁶ God is faithful, for he will increase the later prosperity more than the first one, because of the great glory of the dominion of the Romans.¹⁸⁷

182 Syr. 'spwq'. We follow the emendation proposed by Fraenkel 1902, 100, although it is rejected by PZV ii, 133 n.12 (on the grounds that Mich. Syr. has the same reading). The mistaken reading may therefore go back to their common source. For a detailed discussion see Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 333 n.5; the problematic Syriac word 'spwq' may well be a corruption of the Greek *apothêkê* (store-house) in apposition to *thêsauroi* (depots), so Guidi 1884, 233, Frankel 1902, 100. *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.5 refer to 290 *horrea* (granaries), with some manuscripts preferring 291.

183 *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 105.11–12 refer to 154. The text here is corrupt, and the disappearance of the Roman numeral C (100) is not surprising. See Guidi 1884, 233, Valentini and Zucchetti 1940, 333 n.6.

184 A reference to the 662 *vicomagistri* (deputy magistrates, whose job it was to maintain law and order, cf. Jones 1964, 694) of the *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.19; one manuscript actually refers to 673. See Guidi 1884, 233–4, for the interpretation of the Syriac 'mprkê as a rendering of the Greek *eparkhos*. Behrwald 2006, 758, notes that their place was taken already in the third century by a senator, which shows how anachronistic this list is.

185 *Notitia* and *Curiosum* 104.16 have the same total. It goes back to the early imperial period, however, and does not take into account subsequent fortifications erected (e.g.) by Aurelian: see Jordan 1871, 153. Pliny, *HN* iii.66 gives precisely the same figure for gates in the reign of Vespasian. Behrwald 2006, 759, also notes some parallels between Pliny and the *Breviarium* of the *Notitia*.

186 These last figures are not to be found anywhere in the *Notitia* or *Curiosum*. By contrast, the *Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* 243.56–60, does offer some figures for the dimensions of the city. Jordan 1871, 175–8, discusses the figures in detail and suggests numerous emendations. Although relying on Mai's inaccurate translation, Homo and Carcopino 1933 shed some light on the issue. Homo 1933, 305, notes that 40 Roman miles should be the equivalent of 200,000 feet, which is not far off the figure given here (Mai had only 21,636 feet). He also calculates that the figure for the circumference, 40 miles, i.e. 58.8 km, is broadly in line with the figures given for the diameter, which he calculates as yielding a circumference of 57.7 km, although he does so on the basis of slightly erroneous figures (12 by 13 miles, rather than 12 by 12); cf. Carcopino 1989, 26. Hence it appears that PZ's dimensions are consistent. Pliny, *HN* iii.66–7, offers figures for the length of roads from the city centre to each of the 37 gates, which totals 20.8 miles, i.e. 30.7 km, 60 miles if the suburbs are included, i.e. 88.7 km, cf. Zehnecker 1998, 176. These totals can hardly be related to the figures here offered.

187 This last phrase is PZ's own commentary, i.e. it is distinct from his catalogue; it refers to the aftermath of the Gothic recapture of the city, cf. Guidi 1881, 234. The confidence of an anti-Chalcedonian Syriac-speaking monk of Amida in the future of the Roman state is remarkable.

BOOK TWELVE¹

a. [198] [Chapter Four]² ... he was [admonishing] her not to act disgracefully and harm her spirit on account of the righteous judgment that is to come. She said to him, 'How can I worship him who is invisible, and whom I do not know?' One day after these things took place, she was strolling in her garden, and in her thought these things were stirring in her mind. In a spring of water that was in the garden she saw the image of Jesus our Lord which was painted on a linen cloth³ which was in the water. When

1 The first three chapters and the start of the fourth chapter are lost, along with the list of contents. Curiously, no trace of this book is to be found in Mich. Syr. or indeed any later Syriac sources, save for the latter parts of xii.7, for which some parallels can be found, discussed below.

2 The first part of this chapter is lost. Von Dobschütz 1899, iii.7–9, suggests that we are dealing here either with a sermon or a pastoral letter that probably originated in Greek in Constantinople. The subject is one of the images of Christ 'not made by human hands' (*acheiropoiētos* in Greek) that surfaced in the second half of the sixth century. On this term see von Dobschütz 1899, i.37–9. PZ here refers to three distinct images of Christ: (1) the cloth found by Hypatia, (2) the head-dress worn by Hypatia, in which (1) made its imprint, and (3) a copy of one of these two that was made by a woman from Diobulion in Pontus and installed in a church in her village. The two other images ended up in Caesarea in Cappadocia and Camulia/Camuliana, also in Cappadocia. See von Dobschütz 1899, i.40–3, noting the proximity of all three images, ii.123–4 on Camuliana. PZ's account is unique and differs considerably from the sermon composed in the seventh century that claims that the Camuliana image was found during the reign of Theodosius I and transferred from Camuliana to Caesarea (text in von Dobschütz 1899, iii.17–18): see Meier 2003a, 535–6. In fact, the Camuliana image was translated to Constantinople soon after the time that PZ was writing: Cedrenus i, 685, dates the translation to 574, cf. von Dobschütz 1899, i.47, a date accepted by most modern scholars, but Meier 2003c rightly argues for an earlier dating, before Apamea's sack at the hands of the Persians in 573. What became of the other two images is uncertain. Better known than any of these images of Christ is the image of Edessa, first mentioned by Evagr. iv.27, and discussed in detail by Cameron 1980, 11–12, Cameron 1983, Cameron 1998, Drijvers 1998, Meier 2003a, 387–401. As Meier 2003a, 536–8, notes, we are clearly dealing with a marked increase in the veneration of images in this period; cf. Magdalino 1993, 15–16.

3 Reading (Gk.) *phakeōlion* (of which numerous variants exist), a face-cloth or towel; *poikilē* (*esthēs*), a many-hued garment, is also possible.

she pulled it up, it was not wet. Being amazed, with the headscarf she had on, she covered it in order to honour it, and [199] she brought it to the one who was instructing her and showed it to him. Also there was found on her headscarf a copy of the likeness of that which she had pulled up from the water. One picture came to Caesarea, some time after the [celebration of] the passion of our Lord, and the other was kept in the village of Camulia. A sanctuary was built to honour it by Hypatia,⁴ who had become a Christian. After some time another woman came from the village of Diobulion⁵ in the jurisdiction of Amasea, which was mentioned above. After she learned of these events she became fervent and by some means brought a copy of the icon in Camulia to her own village. In that region they call it *acheiropoiêtos*, which means ‘not made by hands.’⁶ She too built a sanctuary there to honour it, but enough of these things.

b. In the 27th year of the reign of Justinian, in [indiction] year three,⁷ a band of barbarians came to the village of Diobulion and burnt it along with the sanctuary, and took the people into captivity.⁸ Concerned locals informed the serene emperor and solicited him to give a donation for the reestablishment of the temple and the village and for the ransom of the people, and he gave whatever he wished. One of those in the palace who was closely associated with the emperor advised him that the icon of our Lord

4 The period in which this story is set is unclear, so von Dobschütz 1899, i.41. Meier 2003a, 532, suggests that the name Hypatia might be a way of alluding to the famous fifth-century pagan philosopher of Alexandria of this name.

5 We adopt the proposed emendation of von Dobschütz 1899, iii.5 n.8, to read Diobulion, a village in Pontus in the vicinity of Amasea.

6 Just as several scholars have cast doubt on the reference in Evagr. iv.27 to the *acheiropoiêtos* image, on the grounds that it is a later interpolation, so Drijvers 1998, 19, has suggested that this phrase is an insertion. The context in which such interpolations were added was the vigorous disputes over the worship of images in eighth-century Byzantium, discussed by both Drijvers 1998 and Cameron 1998. For a detailed defence of the authenticity of Evagrius’ reference to the image see Whitby 2000, 322–6. PZ’s work was not cited during the iconoclast controversy, unlike Evagrius’, and so the grounds for supposing this to be an insertion are doubtful.

7 The synchronism is slightly awry, since the year three extends from September 554 to the end of August 555, while the 27th year of Justinian’s reign was from 1 April 553 to 1 April 554. Von Dobschütz 1899, iii.8, suggests that PZ might have started Justinian’s regnal years from 1 January 528. More likely PZ may have started Justinian’s second year on 1 October 527, i.e. the start of AG 839: see Dölger 1949, 16, on the survival of this ‘provincial’ tendency. Cf. PZ viii.5f for the only other such synchronism, where there is also an error, but in this case the regnal year is too early.

8 This raid is not otherwise attested, cf. Meier 2003a, 533 n.552, but is by no means implausible. D’yakovov 1939, 89–90, argues somewhat implausibly that the barbarians are the Slavs, now in control of Pontus.

should go around on a tour⁹ to the cities with these priests in order to collect enough money for the building of the sanctuary and the village. Now they have been carrying it around since the third [indiction] year until the ninth.¹⁰ I think that these things happened out of providence, because there are two comings of Christ according to the meaning of Scripture, one that was in humility, and which happened 562 years before this year nine, which is also the 33rd year of the reign of Justinian, and a future one in glory, which we await. This same phenomenon is a type [200] of the progress of the mystery, picture, and wreathed portrait of the King and Lord of the things that are above and below, which will quickly be revealed. And so too I admonish myself and my brothers out of fear of falling into the hands of God, that everyone live in suffering and repentance, for he shall be paid according to his actions, because the coming of our God, the just judge, is near, to whom with his Father and the Holy Spirit be glory.¹¹ Amen.

a. The fifth chapter recounts the powder of ash that fell from the sky.

In addition to everything that was written above and recorded below, the evil and fearful events, the earthquakes, famines, wars in various places,¹²

9 Greek *enkykliā*, which we translate as ‘tour’ (Rundgang), cf. von Dobschütz 1899, iii.6 n.8.

10 The procedure thus took place from 554/5 to 560/1. Land and HB seem to think there may have been a gap in the text here. It is also possible that a copyist wrote this line as a remark about the contemporary progress of the icon. This would mean that our text was originally composed before the ninth year of Justinian, or was composed and then quickly translated or copied from a translation in the ninth year by someone who was aware of the icon’s progress.

11 PZ comes to the point of his excursus: the circulation of the image of Christ foreshadows his return in glory, i.e. the apocalypse. See Meier 2003a, 533–4, Magdalino 1993, 15; on this tendency in Syriac historiography in general see van Ginkel 2007, 207–13, discussing Joh. Eph. *HE* vi.1 and PZ in particular. On the term ‘type’ see PZ viii n.154. Von Dobschütz 1899, iii.8, connects the chronological calculations of PZ here with those of the *Chr. Pasch.* at 685–7/134–6, where the author calculates (under the year 562) that 532 years have elapsed since Christ’s crucifixion and then offers a synchronism of the 35th year of Justinian’s reign with the 532nd year since the crucifixion and the third year of Olympiad 335. The discrepancies between the sources here are the same as at the start PZ ix.0a, cf. n.5. PZ refers instead to Christ’s birth, which he places in 3/2 B.C., and the 33rd regnal year of Justinian, i.e. 559/60, see von Dobschütz, *loc. cit.* Vict. Ton. §175 (a.566/7) also included a dating from the nativity in his chronicle, which covers to 566, cf. Mosshammer 2008, 31.

12 The later years of Justinian’s reign were marked by numerous natural disasters, including renewed outbreaks of the plague of 542. Meier 2003a, 664–9, offers a list, cf. Stathakopoulos, nos. 119–36. PD ii, 112–19/102–7, describes famine and plague in Mesopotamia from 546/7 on, including an outbreak of madness at Amida in 559/60 (discussed in detail by Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 57–73 and Meier 2003a, 412–23, cf. Stathakopoulos no. 135); note also the earthquake of 551 (sources listed at Meier 2003a, 666 n.97, with chronological discussion). We may suppose that at least some of these events were covered in the missing chapters of PZ.

the abundance of iniquity, and lack of love and faith that have happened and which happen now, against us and against this final generation, the curse of Moses in Deuteronomy has been fulfilled, when he warned the people who had come out of Egypt as they were about to enter the promised land, 'If you do not obey the voice of the Lord your God, and do not keep and perform all of his laws and commandments which I command you today, all of these curses will come against you and overtake you.'¹³ A little further on he states, 'The Lord will rain down ash upon your land, and dust from the sky will come down upon you until it destroys you, and he will strike you in front of your enemies, and your corpse will become food for the birds of the sky, and for the wild beasts of the earth, and there will be no one to drive them off.'¹⁴

b. Fearsome things such as these and [things] even more fearsome are coming, for in [indiction] year four, on the first Saturday which is the Saturday before the feast of unleavened bread, the sky above us was covered with storm clouds driven by the east wind, and instead of the usual rain and moistening water, powder made of ash and dust fell on [201] the earth at the command of God, and it was noticeable on stones, and was deposited on walls, and those who are discerning were in fear, trembling, and anxiety instead of the joy of Passover because everything that was written was fulfilled against us because of our sins. That was in the twenty-eighth year of this emperor.¹⁵

c. As regards the scope and sequence of the work, the narration has brought us down sequentially until the fourth [indiction] year, but with regard to one chapter concerning what happened here at the end of the first [indiction] year, which we omitted before this year four, we retrace our route like those on the sea through the tossing of the waves, and recount it briefly as follows.¹⁶

¹³ Deuteronomy 28.15.

¹⁴ Deuteronomy 28.24–26. Whether PZ has any particular defeats in mind is unclear.

¹⁵ PZ refers to April 556. The Syriac text here is highly problematic, perhaps as a result of confusion in a translation from Greek. We are indebted to Jan van Ginkel for discussion on this point. The reference must be, however, to the Easter weekend, whether to the Saturday or the Sunday (15 or 16 April). No other source appears to mention these precise conditions, cf. Meier 2003a, 668; see also PZ ix.4a for a similar reference to the feast of unleavened bread. The synchronisation, like that in xii.4, is slightly out, since Justinian's 28th regnal year was from 554–5. See n.7 above. Telelis 2004 does not refer to this event.

¹⁶ PZ seems here to signal a break from one source to another, retracing his steps from 555/6 to 552/3. The source that he has been using hitherto was clearly impressed by the disasters that had overcome the empire in recent years and believed in the imminent end of the

a. The sixth chapter of the twelfth book concerns Basiliscus, a priest from Antioch who went to Amida with the *dux* Audanus.

While an assembly of bishops was taking place in the royal city in the summer at the end of [indiction] year one,¹⁷ there were certain individuals who were representatives in the cities here, whose names I refrain from mentioning, some of whom I think were jealous or spiteful. They wrote to their bishops who were staying in the West in order to please them and to gratify their ears, saying, ‘There are certain schismatics (meaning ‘dividers’) in the region, especially in Upper Mesopotamia, who are holding councils, and it seems like they are drawing to them the entire people from all around, and they are divided against our church.’¹⁸ The bishops who were there presented the note they had received to the emperor, and he commanded the *dux* Audanus who was at Ḥamimtha, [202] to investigate the matter with Basiliscus, a priest from Antioch, and they were to reconcile them, if they were willing, to the church.¹⁹ Meanwhile, Bar Korgis, a priest from Amida reached them at Ḥamimtha, and he assembled the priests and the residents of the villages in the vicinity of the trench (Gumathena) and forced them ...²⁰

world. PZ now returns to events closer to his home, Amida, as the ‘here’ implies. It is significant that in this next chapter no synchronisms are offered; only indiction years are used, as usually elsewhere in the work. See further Greatrex 2006, 43–4 and pp.55–7 above.

17 Summer 553. The Fifth Ecumenical Council took place in Constantinople in May 553: see Stein 1949, 654–69, for details, Gray 1979, 68–73, Maraval 1998c, 419–23. A tr. and comm. and valuable assessment may be found in Price 2009d, cf. idem 2009c.

18 Certain Chalcedonians were evidently troubled by the persistence of opponents to the council in the East, despite the vigorous actions of Abraham bar Kaili. PZ seems to be referring to agents of the bishops, who were of course absent in Constantinople at this time. There is no reference to any particular gathering of anti-Chalcedonians – described as separatists – at this time, although Jacob Baradaeus was active throughout this period, ordaining 27 bishops in his lengthy career (on which see x.12 above). See Frend 1972, 285–7, Maraval 1998c, 459–60. Normal practice at Amida, at least in the 520s, seems to have consisted in both Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians attending services in the churches of the city, but the latter would refuse to communicate with the former, see Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 102; by this time, they may no longer have attended the same churches. John’s evidence needs to be treated with caution, however, cf. Menze 2008a, 239. Given that part of the aim of the new council was to try to draw the opponents of Chalcedon back into the church, the news from Amida was guaranteed to provoke a reaction. See Greatrex 2007b, 290–1, on the context of the episode.

19 This *Wdn* is otherwise unattested, see *PLRE* iii, *Wdn*, which could represent Aldwin or Evodian, see HB 324 n.4. He was probably the *dux* attached to Amida, although at the time of receiving the emperor’s orders he was at Ḥamimtha, Ammianus’ Abarne (xviii.9.2, xix.8.7), some 70 km north-west of Amida: see Dillemann 1962, 93–4 and 148 fig.17 and Luther 1997, 168–9. On *duces* at Amida see Greatrex 2007c, 93, 97. Basiliscus is not otherwise attested.

20 A part of the text has been lost in transmission. Bar Korgis is otherwise unknown.

and so to say from the property of Donatus, a believer, who had now passed away, and from the territories of Ingilene and Sophanene.²¹ When these men arrived in the city of Amida they exerted pressure on the five chaste residences of monks that were there, in order to drive them out, speaking with them and listening to them.²² They readily met with them, particularly the gentle abbot John, about whom we wrote, [and X],²³ a Greek and a grammarian, who was providentially present, and the diligent Sergius their visitor.²⁴ These men, who were their leaders, were assisted by the learned and believing John, Saba, and Stephen, the *archiatros* of the city. They did not expel the residences of monks, and they departed to Izlâ.²⁵ When the *magister [officiorum]* Peter arrived in [indiction] year two and learned from

Gumathena/Gumtha, i.e. 'the district of the trench', is described by Ammianus (tr. Rolfe) as 'a region rich alike in fertility and tillage' (xviii.9.2), in which Abarne was situated. See Dillemann 1962, 93–4, 110. It was also in this district, on the edge of the territory of Amida, that the (anti-Chalcedonian) monastery of the poplars was located, Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 620.

21 See PZ vii.1a, vii.5e above on Donatus (Dith). It is likely that the Chalcedonian representatives proposed to take over all the property of Donatus on the grounds that, since he was a heretic, Chalcedonians should get priority over opponents of the council when executing his will. See Nov. 115.3.14 (of 542) with Stein 1949, 370, Thurman 1968, 33, Noethlichs 2001, 747–8. Sophanene is the region in which Amida is situated; to the north lay Ingilene.

22 The fact that there remained five monasteries peopled by anti-Chalcedonian monks in the vicinity of Amida is remarkable, given what is recounted of the persecutions unleashed by Abraham bar Kaili; it is likely that he was dead by this point, since he is not mentioned here, cf. Karalewsky 1914, 1240. PZ's account is confirmed by Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 18 (1924), 622, who states that the monks were able to return to their monasteries after 23 years in exile, which implies a date of 559; and that they enjoyed only two years of toleration before being expelled once more. His chronology, however, is doubtful, and one may presume that the restoration took place somewhat earlier and lasted longer. See Ashbrook Harvey 1990, 68, who fails to discuss the chronology, however.

23 A part of the text has been lost in transmission; we have followed the suggestion of HB 324 n.10.

24 The defusing of the crisis through discussions is also noteworthy. From the specific adjectives applied to John, [X] and Sergius, one may suppose that they were known to PZ (or his source). Brooks, PZV ii, 137 n.1, suggested that Sergius refers to the future abbot of the monastery of John Urtâyê, Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 225–7; John describes him as a leading citizen of Amida, from the house of Bar Deba, who took charge of the monastery in the second half of the 560s. He thus could well be the Sergius here indicated. The other two individuals are otherwise unknown.

25 For Stephen see *PLRE* iii, Stephanus 13, not otherwise attested; likewise John and Saba. The conclusion was the withdrawal of the monks to Mount Izla, to the south-east of Amida, on which see Dillemann 1962, 32–4 and PZ x n.137; they had followed just the same course in the 530s, during the persecutions of Ephraem, Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 17 (1923), 621. Later they followed the same course again, cf. Joh. Eph. *Lives*, PO 19 (1925), 227.

the monks [of] the threats against them, he reassured them and restrained the *dux* from again expelling the monks and censured him.²⁶

a. The seventh chapter gives information concerning the map of the world that was made through the diligence of Ptolemy Philometor, the king of Egypt.²⁷

26 This visit of Peter the Patrician to the eastern frontier is not mentioned by any other source. On this episode see Antonopoulos 1990, 153–4, *PLRE* iii, Petrus 6. Indiction year two is 553/4. With the involvement of Peter, the *magister officiorum* and chief diplomat of Justinian's reign, in ecclesiastical politics we might compare the intervention of the diplomat John Comentiolus in 567 or 568, who held talks in Callinicum in an unsuccessful bid to bridge the gap between Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians, on which see Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 136, Maraval 1998d, 465–6.

27 PZ describes the catalogue of provinces and cities that follows as a *skariphos*, a term meaning 'delineation' or 'outline': see Bagrow 1948, 72, Witakowski 2007, 235. Most scholars assume that PZ was drawing on a version of the *Geography* of Claudius Ptolemaeus (Ptolemy), an epitome that may have been produced by a later geographer such as Pappus of Alexandria (fourth century A.D.) or Marcianus of Heraclea (sixth century). So Honigmann 1929, 115–16, Czeglédý 1971, 135–6, 140–1; cf. Hewsen 1992, 16, Berggren and Jones 2000, 50–1, Gautier Dalché 2009, 71, on these (lost) adaptations of Ptolemy's work. Gautier Dalché 2009, 50–3, argues that PZ has christianised Ptolemy's work, making it into a typical late antique list; his suggestion, however, that he took it from Zach. is implausible. Writing around the same time as PZ, Cassiodorus, in his *Institutiones* (i.25), offers great praise of Ptolemy's work and the maps that accompanied it, cf. Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 28. Land 1887, 168–70, argues that PZ also had access to the maps that accompanied Ptolemy's work. Hewsen 1971 offers a reconstruction of Pappus' work on the basis of the *Geography* of Ananias of Shirak. It contains no totals of cities in the various provinces, however, and so cannot have been the only source of PZ, if he did indeed make use of it; see further n.31 below. Bagrow 1948, 72, suggests, however, that PZ need not be derived from Ptolemy and that the coincidence in his description of places and provinces mentioned may be attributed rather to the fact that the same information was available to any scholar. Honigmann's view remains the more plausible, since, as will be seen, PZ's account is remarkably close to Ptolemy's work. Moreover, Ptolemy's work – or a version of it – was also used by Jacob of Edessa in his *Hexaemeron* in the seventh century: see Nöldeke 1902, 428, Darmesteter 1890, with Jac. Ede. *Hex.* 115–16/96–7 (the list of provinces) and Wilks 2008, 224. Jacob's list differs from PZ's, however, and uses different Syriac versions of names (e.g. Mâsopotâmâ for Mesopotamia, rather than PZ's Bet Nahrain, cf. n.106 below), and thus there is unlikely to be a direct link between them; see further Darmesteter 1890, 181–3, highlighting differences between Jacob and Ptolemy. Occasionally PZ offers additional remarks or additions, which may well be due to the epitomator. The whole section recalls the description of Rome at x.16, in that it offers a summary of the most basic data about a place supplemented by a few incidental remarks. As is also the case with x.16, another version of the section survives, in this case BL Add. 14,620, fol.28, ascribed to Zachariah. This version frequently preserves a fuller or less garbled version of what is found in our principal MS, so Land 1887, 168.

As the *Chronicle* of Eusebius of Caesarea makes known, Ptolemy Philadelphus ruled Egypt 280 years before the birth of our Lord, and at the start of his reign he set free the Jewish captives who were in Egypt. He sent offerings to Jerusalem, to Eleazar²⁸ who was [high] priest at the time. He assembled seventy scholars of the law and had the holy Scriptures translated from the Hebrew language into Greek [203] which he stored and kept with him, because he had been inspired as though by God in this matter, in preparation for the calling of the nations who were worthy of knowledge, to become true worshippers of the glorious Trinity through the ministry of the spirit.²⁹

b. About 130 years after him, Ptolemy Philometor was also moved with virtue and was diligent, and through ambassadors, letters, and presents which he sent and dispatched to the leaders of the countries of the nations, he urged them to write and send to him the boundaries of the territories of their dominions, and the nations around them, as well as where they resided and what their customs were.³⁰ They wrote and sent [them] to him, except the northern region, extending to the east and to the west. We have considered it necessary to write it out here at the end for the edification of those who have discernment. The account of it is as follows.³¹

28 Reading with HB 325 n.4 for 'Izra'el'.

29 Jerome, *Chron.* 129 places the freeing of the Jews in year two of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 283 B.C. Mich. Syr. v.6 (79/123) offers no precise date for the event; a little further down (80–1/123) he describes the translation of the Old Testament made at his behest in more detail than PZ. We must assume that PZ was working from the original Greek version of the *Chronicle*, a work that has not survived in this form. Cf. Greatrex 2006, 45 and n.3, on later Syriac translations. The tradition concerning the sponsoring of the translation project by Ptolemy and the honours he bestowed on the Jews originates in the *Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates*, a work of doubtful historical value that originated in Egypt probably in the late second century B.C. It was, however, largely believed in antiquity and is accepted (e.g.) by Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* 12.11–118, Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.12.1–2, Mal. 8.7. See Hadas 1951, ch.33, for the relevant section of the letter with the discussion in Gruen 1998, 206–11.

30 PZ is wide of the mark here, since there is no connection between Ptolemy VI Philometor (180–145 B.C.) and the geographer Claudius Ptolemaeus (second century A.D.). The confusion of cartographer and monarch is not unique to PZ: see Honigsmann 1929, 116.

31 PZ's survey proceeds from west to east, as does Ptolemy's. While Ptolemy lists the cities and other natural features of the provinces, together with their positions, PZ merely offers a total of the number of cities. This figure he presumably obtained from his source. The figures seem broadly in line with the lists in Ptolemy, although they probably do not take into account the fact that Ptolemy listed not only cities, but also villages and even natural features, as Land 1887, 169, notes. Naturally, nearly all the data here offered goes back to the second century A.D. (and indeed beyond this, since Ptolemy himself was relying on earlier sources), including the provincial divisions for the Roman empire. With such a list of provinces and

- c. (i) Northwestern Europe: 77 cities; it is not easy for us to write out their names.
- (ii) Outer Hispania: 80 cities.
- (iii) Inner Hispania II: 44 cities.
- (iv) Hispania Tertia, which is on the ocean: 240 cities and many islands in the ocean that are called 'white'.³²
- (v) Southeastern Celtogalatia, [a group of] 19 barbarian people each one having its own city and people.³³
- (vi) The territory of Celtogalatia³⁴ of [the city] Lug³⁵ on [204] the ocean: 27 cities.³⁶
- (vii) The territory of the Belgae: 35 cities.³⁷
- (viii) The territory of Narbonensia, 28 cities.³⁸
- (ix) Germais:³⁹ 12 cities.
- (x) The territory of Panonnia: 27 cities.

cities one may compare the fourth-century or early fifth-century *Notitia Galliarum*, or the *Synekdēmos* of Hierocles, compiled under Justinian, although both of these do give the names of the cities concerned; see Jones 1964, 712–15, on these works and lists of cities generally. Note also the list of provinces (but without the number of cities) compiled by Polemius Silvius in the mid-fifth century. According to Hewsén 1992, 30–1, the *Synekdēmos* may have used a source that was also exploited by Ananias of Shirak in compiling his *Geography* in the seventh century; at least in some cases, Ananias does give a figure for the number of cities in a province, although it is invariably much smaller than that given by PZ. PZ's figures occasionally do tally with those of Hierocles, notably in the provinces of Asia Minor (e.g. Pamphylia: 46 cities in Hierocles, 43 in PZ, Lycia has 34 in both), although it does not follow from this that they were drawing on the same source: they may simply be accurately reflecting the actual number of cities.

32 Hispania, i.e. Spain. Ptol. ii.4, Baetica is PZ's Outer Hispania. Ptol.'s Lusitania, ii.5, is PZ's Inner Hispania. Ptol.'s Tarraconensis, ii.6, is PZ's Hispania Tertia as far as the Ocean. At ii.3 Ptol. refers to the island of Alouion in the Ocean, cf. Marcianus, *Periplus*, 560–1, who has Albion (cf. Lat. *albus*, white), i.e. Britain.

33 All of the variants cited here are from BL Add. 14,620, unless otherwise stated. Here add 'but their principal city is Celtogalatia'.

34 Or 'The territory of another Celtogallia'. Cf. Ptol. ii.7, Celtogalatia Aquitania, ii.8, Ludgunensis, a name somewhat garbled by PZ.

35 Both MSS have 'Lul', corrected by Brooks.

36 Or '33 cities'.

37 Or 'Belgica, 37 cities'. Cf. Ptol. ii.9, Belgica.

38 Or '83 cities, but according to another manuscript, 77' (PZV ii, 138 n.6). Cf. Ptol. ii.10, Narbonensis.

39 Cf. Ptol. ii.11, Germania Magna. Add. 14,620 refers also to Noricum (13 cities, although in the margin 53 has been indicated), cf. Ptol. ii.13, but Raetia and Vindelicia have dropped out (Ptol. ii.12).

- (xi) Lower Panonnia: 23 cities.⁴⁰
- (xii) The territory of Dalmatia: 62⁴¹ cities, not including the islands which do not have cities.
- (xiii) The large island of Cynus: 22 cities.⁴²
- (xiv) The large island of Sicily: 76 cities.⁴³
- (xv) The territory of Sarmatia on the ocean: 18 cities, and there are many barbarian nations there; and in Paragnata there are large funerary monuments that Alexander built.⁴⁴
- (xvi) Tauricinus⁴⁵ a region all of which is in the sea, and its entry is from⁴⁶ the dry land: 17 cities.
- (xvii) The territory of Anzygon:⁴⁷ eight cities.
- (xviii) The territory of Dacia: 44 cities.⁴⁸
- (xix) Upper Moesia: 17 cities.
- (xx) Lower Moesia: 28 cities.⁴⁹
- (xxi) The territory of Thrace: [17 cities].⁵⁰
- (xxii) Byzantium on the mouth of the Hellespont:⁵¹ 40 cities.⁵²
- (xxiii) The territory of Cherson: 40 cities.⁵³
- (xxiv) The territory of Macedonia: 128 cities; and its borders are with

40 Cf. Ptol. ii.14–15, Pannonia Superior and Inferior. Add. 14,620 adds a reference to Italy here, 'Italia', the territory of Rome: 301 cities; but according to another manuscript, 295 cities' (cf. Ptol. iii.1).

41 Or '68'. Cf. Ptol. ii.16, Illyricum, of which Dalmatia is a part.

42 PZ renders Corsica as Cynus, the usual Greek version, cf. Ptol. iii.2. Add. 14,620 refers also to Sardinia (cf. Ptol. iii.3), 'The large island of Sardinia: 33 cities'.

43 Cf. Ptol. iii.4.

44 For Sarmatia cf. Ptol. iii.5. At iii.5.25 (11–12), Ptol. refers to the Tyrangetai, a tribe near Dacia, clearly the people here indicated by PZ. In references to Ptol. the figures in brackets refer to the earlier editions (noted in the bibliography), where there is a variation from the most recent one. Ptol. also refers to the altars of Alexander that lie beyond a bend of the Tanais (Don). PZ, or rather his source, tends to reproduce more of Ptolemy's account when it concerns (1) a royal place, referred to in Ptol. as *basileion*, (2) a place associated with Alexander or (3) a people which exhibit peculiar customs, e.g. cannibalism; he also occasionally notes particular products that come from a region. Cf. Gautier Dalché 2009, 52–3, on PZ's interests.

45 Thus Add. 14,620; MS A has 'Tauricini'. Cf. Ptol. iii.6, the Tauric Chersonese (Crimea).

46 Or 'in'.

47 Cf. Ptol. iii.7, the Iazyges Metanastoi.

48 Cf. Ptol. iii.8, Dacia.

49 Cf. Ptol. iii.9–10, Moesia Superior, Moesia Inferior.

50 From Add. 14,620, cf. Ptol. iii.11.

51 From Add. 14,620; Brooks printed 'Thrace, that is Byzantium on the mouth of the Hellespont ...' Ptol. does not have a separate section for Byzantium.

52 Or '48'.

53 Cf. Ptol. iii.12, although in earlier editions it was subsumed under iii.11.

Dalmatia and Thrace, and its main city is Philippi.⁵⁴

(xxv) The territory of Epirus: [205] 25⁵⁵ cities.⁵⁶

(xxvi) The territory of Achaea: 65 cities, where Attica is, which is Athens.⁵⁷

(xxvii) The large island of the Peloponnesus:⁵⁸ 107 cities,⁵⁹ where Corinth is.

(xxviii) The island⁶⁰ of Crete: 38 cities.⁶¹

Europe is finished with 1750 cities.⁶²

d. The beginning of Libya.

(i) The region of Mauretania on the ocean in the southwest: 30 cities.⁶³

(ii) Outer Mauretania: 113 cities.⁶⁴

(iii) The territory of Africa opposite from Rome: 158 cities.⁶⁵

(iv) The territory of Cyrenaica: 25 cities.⁶⁶

(v) Egypt, the territory of Alexandria: 152 cities; the southern border of Egypt is the territory of Nitriotis⁶⁷ where rain does not fall.⁶⁸

54 Cf. Ptol. iii.13 (12), Macedonia. The mention of Philippopolis may be linked to PZ's tendency to pick up references to Alexander; Philip II of Macedon (359–336 B.C.) was Alexander's father. Alternatively, Paul's letter to the Philippians may have suggested the mention, so Land 1887, 170.

55 Or '28'.

56 Cf. Ptol. iii.14 (13), Epirus.

57 Cf. Ptol. iii.15 (14), Achaea. See also next note.

58 Cf. Ptol. iii.16 (subsumed under Achaea, iii.14.25, in earlier editions). PZV ii, 138.18, 'Popelon', Add. 14,620, 'Polepon', Ptol., *Peloponnēsos*. Athens and Corinth may be singled out because of their intrinsic historical interest or because of their New Testament connections: see Land 1887, 170.

59 Or 'and Ilon [? Hellas]', i.e. Greece.

60 Or 'large island'.

61 Cf. Ptol. iii.15 (17), Crete.

62 Or 'There are 2050 cities in it.'

63 Cf. Ptol. iv.1, Mauretania Tingitana.

64 Cf. Ptol. iv.2, Mauretania Caesariensis.

65 Ptol. iv.3, Africa. Add. 14,620 adds the intriguing comment 'where Syriac and Roman (i.e. Latin) are spoken'. If there is any foundation to this, one might see in it a reference to the survival of Punic in the province, since Carthage was a Phoenician foundation; Land 1887, 171, suggests that Ptol.'s reference to *libykoi Phoinikes* (iv.3.6) may have inspired the remark.

66 Cf. Ptol. iv.4, Cyrenaica.

67 MS A: *mṭr'wt'*; Add. 14,620: 'Mareota', Ptolemy (iv.5.25): *Nitriôtai*.

68 Add: 'and in the eastern part of which live the Egyptians who eat fish (Ichthyophagoi), and quarry every colour of marble' (which derives from Ptol.). Cf. Ptol. iv.5, Marmarikai, Libya and Egypt. At iv.5.25 (12) Ptol. refers to the Nitriotai and Oasitai in the south of Egypt.

(vi) Inner Libya and the islands that are in the sea: in this Libya there are 50 cities.⁶⁹

Libya is finished with 521 cities.⁷⁰

e. The territory of Outer Ethiopia.⁷¹

(i) Outer Ethiopia: 43 cities,⁷² where Mount Pan⁷³ is located. The people, who are short,⁷⁴ are between Tobazium,⁷⁵ and to the east of them [206] they eat roots.⁷⁶ [Next to them]⁷⁷ are the people of Axum,⁷⁸ of Shabbar, of Mulab, of Barag, and the Blemyes,⁷⁹ and beyond them are the Cubit-people,⁸⁰ and to the west of them they eat birds,⁸¹ and to the south of them is the people who are the Katadrai and the myrrh-bearing country,⁸² from where beet comes; and down from them are the Pesandarai who eat elephants, and beyond them is the land that produces cinnamon.⁸³

(ii) Inner Ethiopia, where Mount Linus is, from which the three Nile Rivers flow from lakes of snow.⁸⁴ To the east of the mountain live a people

69 Cf. Ptol. iv.6, Libya interior; the islands are mentioned at iv.6.33–4 (14).

70 Or '515'.

71 Lit. 'Outer Cush,' and so throughout. Ptol. iv.7 deals with Ethiopia. PZ (or rather his source) clearly found more of interest in this region than elsewhere.

72 Or '45'.

73 Or 'Paran'. Ptol. iv.7.26 (3) refers rather to Mount Elephas.

74 Ptolemy refers to the Koloboi here, as at iv.7.7; as Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 459 n.210, note, the Greek means 'dwarfs'. The reading adopted is from BL 14,620 following Brooks; MS A reads 'They live between ...'

75 Ptol. iv.7.28 (10) refers to *to Bazion akron* (Bazion point); see the preceding note on the short people. In the margin of Add. 14,620 the reading Mount Barir may be found.

76 The Root-eaters (Rhizophagoi) are mentioned by Ptol. iv.7.29 (10).

77 Following Add. 14,620 with Brooks; MS A has 'with their hearts'.

78 Various misspellings in Syriac MSS.; Ptolemy iv.7.29 (10) has Auxoumitai.

79 From Add. 14,620; Brooks adopts rather MS A's 'Blemes'.

80 Ptolemy: *Pêchinoi*; the Syriac reads lit. 'a cubit high.' At iv.7.29 (10) Ptol. refers to the Auxoumitai, then the Soboridai, the Molibai, the Megabardoi, the Blemyes (Blemmyes) and Pechinoi, a name that PZ's source confused with the Greek *pêchus*, a cubit, cf. HB 326.

81 Cf. Ptol. iv.7.31 (10) on the Struthophagoi.

82 Ptol. iv.7.31 (10) has *Katadrai kai hê smyrnophoros chôra*, while the Syriac MSS refer to a people 'kataphoroi of frankincense', which eludes translation; cf. section g (viii) below, concerning the Malikhai, for similar phrasing. We therefore here revert to Ptol. Ptolemy makes no reference, however, to the production of beet. At 7.34 (10) he refers to the elephant-eating Ethiopians, beyond whom lie the Pesendarai. Beyond some lakes he places a cinnamon-bearing land.

83 Add: 'Inner (sic!) Ethiopia is finished. 45 illustrious cities and 9 nations.'

84 Ptol. iv.8 concerns Ethiopia interior. At 8.3 (2) he refers to the Mountain of the Moon

who are cannibals, and beyond them are the Rhapsian Ethiopians, and from there to the great body of water of the western ocean the Ethiopians control, and they eat fish; and to the south of them until uninhabited territory live those who are called the ‘Western Ethiopians,’ and there are others in the east, who live on the water and eat fruits.⁸⁵ To the east of the Ethiopians is the region of the white elephants, which is called Agisymba,⁸⁶ and a mountain that is nameless.

The end of Ethiopia, with 43 cities.⁸⁷

f. The beginning of the region of Asia.

(i) The Pontic Sea: Bithynia,⁸⁸ the land of Chalcedon: 24⁸⁹ cities. [207]

(ii) Asia: the territory of Ephesus, 147 cities.⁹⁰

(iii) Also the territory of Lycia: 34 cities.⁹¹

(iv) The territory of Galatia and Isauria: 72 cities.⁹²

(v) The territory of Pamphylia: 43 cities.⁹³

(vi) The territory of Cappadocia: 87 cities.⁹⁴

(vii) Lesser Armenia: 78 cities, where Melitene is.

(viii) The territory of Cilicia: 35 cities.⁹⁵

(Greek *selênês*, of which the first syllable has been lost), from which the Nile lakes receive the watershed.

85 Cf. Ptol. iv.8.3 (2) also for the cannibalistic people. Ptol. refers here likewise to the Rhapsioi Ethiopians, the Fish-eaters (Ichthyophagoi), and to the Hesperioi (i.e. western) Ethiopians to the south. Those to the east, who eat fruit, are not mentioned in Ptol., cf. HB 326.

86 Following Ptolemy iv.8.4–5 (2), Agisymba, referring also to the white elephants; MS A has ‘*t’wr’*’, Add. 14,620 has ‘which is called Atrâ [lit. ‘place’].’

87 Add ‘In which there are six nations and three races of Ethiopians.’

88 Restored from Ptolemy; MS A, followed by PZT, has *qwtny*’, Add. 14,620 ‘Cithynica’. Cf. Ptol. v.1, Pontus and Bithynia. The confusion between b and k in Syriac is an easy one. The reference to Chalcedon – and significantly not Constantinople – is interesting and might point to an earlier date for the epitome, before Constantine’s refoundation. Land 1887, 171, suggests that PZ refers to Chalcedon because of its importance for church history, but, given his attitude to the council held there, this seems implausible.

89 Or ‘30’.

90 Add ‘But according to another manuscript, 159’. Cf. Ptol. v.2 on Asia. The mention of Ephesus might be connected to the letter of St Paul, cf. n.54 above (on Philippi).

91 Cf. Ptol. v.3, Lycia.

92 Cf. Ptol. v.4, v.4.12 (9) on Isauria, which is not distinguished in any way from other parts of the province.

93 Cf. Ptol. v.5, Pamphylia.

94 Cf. Ptol. v.6, Cappadocia.

95 In the new edition of Stückelberger and Grasshoff, Lesser Armenia follows at Ptol. v.7, although they note, 522 n.1, that only some manuscripts start a new chapter at this point. In

(ix) The territory of Sarmatia: 33 cities, and its border reaches to the north which is uninhabited, and its residents eat horses, and there horses and chariots are very plentiful, and there are many barbarian nations.⁹⁶

(x) The territory of Colchis⁹⁷ has ten cities.

(xi) The territory of Iberia:⁹⁸ seven cities.

(xii) Albania:⁹⁹ 34 cities.

(xiii) Greater Armenia: 84¹⁰⁰ cities, and out from its borders flow the Euphrates and the Tigris.

(xiv) The island¹⁰¹ of Cyprus: 20 cities.

(xv) The territory of Syria: 128 cities. That which is called the Valley of Syria is the coast that goes up from Rhosus to Jerusalem; there are the Syrian Gates.¹⁰²

(xvi) Palestine of Syria: Jerusalem, 45 cities.¹⁰³

(xvii) The territory of Arabia: 35 cities. Between the Black Mountain as far as Egypt live the Tayy, and the Monychiaty,¹⁰⁴ from the mountain to Bostra.¹⁰⁵

(xviii) The Upper Mesopotamia of the Edessenes: 70 cities.¹⁰⁶

(xix) The Arabian wilderness¹⁰⁷ stretches from Mount Sinai to beyond

earlier editions Cilicia followed Cappadocia at v.7, and Armenia Minor was subsumed under Cappadocia at v.6.18–25.

96 Cf. Ptol. v.9 (8), Sarmatia. At 9.1 (8.1) Ptol. notes the unknown people to the north, at 9.16 (8.10) the horse-eaters (Hippophagoi).

97 From Ptolemy v.9, following Brooks. MS A: *qwlkydws*, Add. 14,620: 'Qlky' (Colchi).

98 So Add. 14,620; MS A: 'Icheria'. Cf. Ptol. v.11 (10).

99 So Add. 14,620; MS A: 'Alabania', adopted by Brooks. Cf. Ptol. v.12 (11).

100 Or '83'. Cf. Ptol. v.13 (12), Armenia Maior, 13.6–7 (12.1) on the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates.

101 Or 'the large island', cf. Ptol. v.14 (13), Cyprus.

102 Cf. Ptol. v.15 (14), Syria. The reference to the valley from Rhosus, north of Seleucia Pieria on the coast of Cilicia, to Jerusalem is not in Ptolemy; Ptol. likewise does not mention any Syrian Gates. Rhosus is mentioned by Hierocles, *Synekdēmos* 705.7. The Syrian Gates lie 35 km due north of Antioch, cf. Talbert 2000, 67 C4.

103 Cf. Ptol. v.16 (15), Palestine-Judaea.

104 Restored from Ptolemy v.17.3 (v.16.3); Brooks, following MS A has '*mnqlyw*'; Add. 14,620 'Mytichi (?)'.

105 Cf. Ptol. v.17 (16), Arabia Petraea. At 17.3 (16.3) he refers to the Saracens (PZ's Tayyâyê) between the mountains and Egypt, as also to the Mounychiaty. Ptol. 17.7 for the reference to Bostra.

106 Cf. Ptol. v.18 (17), Mesopotamia, although he does not single out Edessa. For 'Mesopotamia' PZ uses the usual Syriac term Bet Nahrain, cf. PZ vii n.22.

107 So Add. 14,620; MS A has 'The wilderness and Arabia'. Cf. Ptol. v.19 (18), Arabia Deserta.

Babylon,¹⁰⁸ [208] and its northern border is on the Euphrates where the Kauchabenoï¹⁰⁹ live, and to the west the Batani, and to the south the Agobeni, and to the east of Babylon the Orchenii, and the entire central region is controlled by the children of Hagar.¹¹⁰ There are 40 cities in this wilderness.¹¹¹

Asia is finished with 980¹¹² cities.

g. The territory of the Persians.

(i) The territory of Babylon: 28 cities.¹¹³

(ii) Assyria: 34¹¹⁴ cities; here the Qadishites worship horses,¹¹⁵ and Gorgun is the city of the king of kings.¹¹⁶

(iii) Media: 80 cities, but the Qadishites and Gelai live at the southern edge of Media, and at the northern end are the Kurds and the Marudai, and the Agorai Gates are there.¹¹⁷

(iv) The territory of Susiana to the south and east of Babylon: 18 cities.¹¹⁸

108 Add. 14,620 has rather 'to Babylon'. It adds 'and at its southern end are the Kurds, and at its eastern end are the Arabs, and there are the Gates of Agora'.

109 In the margin of Add. 14,620, 'Kaukhabioi'.

110 Ptol. v.19 (18) makes no mention of Mt Sinai. At 19.2 he places the Kauchabênoi on the lower Euphrates, the Batanaioi he situates next to Syria, the Agoubênoi next to Arabia Felix, and the Orchenoi next to the Persian Gulf. PZ's source clearly preferred cardinal points here (and elsewhere) to Ptol.'s method of locating peoples in relation to areas. The children of Hagar are the desert Arab tribes, cf. (e.g.) Millar 2005, 301–4: the allusion is to the notion that they were descended from Hagar, the servant of Sarah, Abraham's wife, and mother of his child Ishmael (Genesis 16).

111 Or: '94 are in this desert, but according to another manuscript, 90 ancient cities.'

112 Or '1438'.

113 Cf. Ptol. v.20 (19).

114 Or: '(Babylonia): '84 cities; but 28 ancient cities is written in another manuscript. Assyria: 40'.

115 So Add. 14,620; MS A has 'worshipped'.

116 Cf. Ptol. vi.1, Assyria. The detail on the Qadishites does not come from Ptol., nor does that concerning Gorgun (a river at Ptol. 1.7). The city of Gorgo (or Gurgan in the Persian sources) lay south-east of the Caspian Sea, i.e. where Ptolemy places the Kadousioi (vi.2.5); Proc. Wars i.3.10 mentions a city of Gorgo close to the frontier with the Hephthalites. See Bivar, *Elr* 11 (2003), 152–3, Marquart 1901, 72–4. The region was known as Hyrcania. It is obscure why PZ should regard the city of Gorgo as particularly royal. As Czeglédý 1971, 136, points out, PZ identifies Ptol.'s Kadousioi with the Qadishites with whom he was familiar, even though they lived well to the south-west of the Kadousioi of Ptol., cf. PZ ix.2a and n.31; see also Land 1887, 172.

117 Cf. Ptol. vi.2, Media. At 2.5 he places the Kadousioi and the Lêgai by the sea (i.e. the Caspian, to the north, not the south, as PZ states); inland lie the Kardouchoi and Maroundai. At 2.7 he refers to the gates of Zagros, i.e. the Zagros mountains (PZ's Agorai).

118 Cf. Ptol. vi.3, Susiana.

(v) Persia: 33¹¹⁹ cities; in the southern region [on the edge of the sea]¹²⁰ live the Nyṭ', and the eaters of horses,¹²¹ and to the north of them are the Huns, and two islands opposite the region, one of which is named for Alexander.¹²²

(vi) Parthia: 24 cities, where the court of the king is.¹²³ [209]

(vii) The large desert of Carmania to the south [sic] of Parthia, in whose southern part live the Isatikhai and in the east the Garanopyrdes.¹²⁴

(viii) Edamonos,¹²⁵ a region of Arabia:¹²⁶ 143 cities. It is to the south of the former, and there are located Zarma and Baraiu¹²⁷ the royal city, there are the Shakhalitōi, a people on the gulf that is called Akhaniṭu,¹²⁸ from where pearls are brought up, and where they travel on [boats made from] skins. There is the gulf that is called the 'Persian Gulf,' and the inhabitants eat fish.¹²⁹ The tent-dwellers control the region to the north and they are called Shabbaiōi, [which is Sheba,]¹³⁰ and to the south of them are the Ṭayy.¹³¹ There is the nation of the Malikhai¹³² and beyond them is the country that produces incense, where there is a large nation called the Minaiai, and the Dosarenai and the Mokritaioi, and beyond them the Auphirai, which is

119 Or '39'.

120 Omitted in MS A, added from Add. 14,620.

121 Add: 'and cannibals'.

122 Cf. Ptol. vi.4, Persia. Ptol.'s Taokênê at 4.3 may be what lies behind PZ's 'Nyt'; Ptol.'s next entry concerns the horse-eaters (Hippophagoi), followed by the Souzaioi (Huzaye in Add. 14,620, Huns in MS A; Stückelberger and Grasshoff, 613 n.66, prefer the reading Ouzaioi in Ptol.). See Land 1887, 173, who suggests a link with the Ouxioi of Strabo xi.13.6, whom he places near the Sousioi (Susians); the region was later known as Khuzistan. Ptol. 4.8 refers to three islands, one of them named after Alexander.

123 Ptol. vi.5, Parthia. The royal gate referred to must be Hecatompylon basileion at 5.2. On PZ's tendency to single out royal places see n.44 above.

124 Cf. Ptol. vi.6, the desert of Carmania. At 6.2 he refers to the Isatikhai in the south and the Gadanopyrdes in the middle (so also Add. 14,620).

125 Cf. Ptol. vi.7, Arabia Eudaimôn (Felix).

126 Following Add. 14,620; MS A has 'northern', Ptolemy, 'Arabia'.

127 Or 'Badeô'. See also next note.

128 Or 'Akhita'. Cf. Ptol. 7.5 for Zabram basileion, 7.6, Badeô basileion. At 7.11 he refers to the Sakhalitōi, cf. 7.46 (the Sakhalite Gulf).

129 The information on the pearls and the use of bladders for sailing is unique, cf. HB 326. Ptol. refers, however, at 7.14 to the islands in the gulf, in which live the Fish-eaters, the Ichthyophagoi.

130 Omitted in Add. 14,620 and not found in Ptolemy.

131 At 7.21 Ptol. places the Skênitai (i.e. tent-dwellers) in the north; PZ has added the details about the Shabbayê (Sabaeans), cf. HB 326. To the south of them live the Saracens, PZ's Ṭayyayê.

132 Or 'And to the south(?) of them are the Malikhoi (Ptolemy: Malikhai) who are called *mlkw't*'. The Malikhoi are in Ptol. 7.23, where he alludes to a region that is myrrh-bearing.

Ophir;¹³³ and also the Archintai,¹³⁴ that is, [those who live] on the slope of the mountain, and on Mount Marṭon to the north are the Melakhitai and the Dacharennoi,¹³⁵ and across from them are the Iritnaiai and the Biululinaï,¹³⁶ and the Mamitinoi.¹³⁷ To their east are the Kottabanoi, all the way to Mount Ophir, where myrrh is produced.¹³⁸ And to the north of them are the Nobaritoi,¹³⁹ and beyond them the Alumitai,¹⁴⁰ the Sophanitai, [210] and the Kythebanitai;¹⁴¹ and beyond them are the Kharai and the Motikai,¹⁴² as far as the Sakhalintai.¹⁴³ To the south of them are the Urtaioi,¹⁴⁴ the Sitirai, and the Dathinaï¹⁴⁵ with many islands, but the royal cities are Duana, Carmana, Emanis, Are, and Shawa.¹⁴⁶

(ix) The territory of Carmania, the first to the east: 12 cities.¹⁴⁷ The region to the south is occupied by camel-herders, and the Schosotai,¹⁴⁸ and beyond them on the sea are the Pargadikinaï,¹⁴⁹ who eat swallows.¹⁵⁰

133 Where PZ refers to Ophir, Ptol. (vi.7.23) has the more biblical Sabaeans; the other peoples noted by PZ are all in this same section of Ptol.

134 Or Add. 14,620, 'Arkhitai'. Ptol. refers rather to the Agkhitai beyond Mount Klimax (i.e. Ladder Mountain).

135 Add 'who are called Bakharenai'. Ptol. vi.7.23 refers to Malangitai and Dakharimênnoi (Darkhênnoi).

136 Or 'Iritai and Bilulinaï'; Ptolemy vi.7.24, 'Eiritai ... Biloulaioi'. Ptol. has Zeiritai (Eiritai in some MSS) and Blioulaioi.

137 Ptol. vi.7.24: 'Omagkitai' (variant: Omanitai).

138 This section is taken over almost directly from Ptol. vi.7.24, although the names have been somewhat distorted. Add. 14,620 in several places offers a version closer to Ptol. than MS A. The one difference is the mention of Mount Ophir, which replaces Ptol.'s Asaboi mountains.

139 Add. 14,620 and Ptol. vi.7.24: 'Iobarites'.

140 Add. 14,620: 'Ulamites', Ptol. vi.7.24: 'Aloumeôtai'.

141 Add. 14,620: 'qybṭbnytw' who are called qwtṭyḃ'nytw'.

142 Add. 14,620: 'Kharamotikai'. PZ's Kharai and Motikoi represent a garbling of Ptol.'s Khatramôthitai, vi.7.25.

143 Add. 14,620 and Ptol. vi.7.25: 'Sakhalitai'. PZ (or his source) seems to have transcribed the Greek name Sakhalitai differently here and a few lines above (209.6).

144 The Urtaioi are placed where Ptol. has the Masônitai; see Land 1887, 173, with PZ vii n.54 on the Urtayê (in southern Armenia, hence rather misplaced here).

145 Add. 14,620 and Ptol. vi.7.25: 'Siritai and Rhathinaï'. The confusion of d and r in Syriac is common.

146 Ptol.'s Ravana basileion (vi.7.33 [26]), Karman basileion (7.34), Menambis basileion (7.38, 'Menankhos' in Add. 14,620), Sabê basileion (7.42).

147 Cf. Ptol. vi.8, Carmania.

148 Add. 14,620 and Ptol. vi.8.12: 'Sôxotai'.

149 Add. 14,620: 'Pargadikai', Ptolemy: 'Pasargadai'.

150 Ptol. vi.8.12: PZ's source has confused *khelidôn*, the Greek word for a swallow with *khelônê*, the word for a turtle.

(x) The territory of Hyrcania to the north on the sea, the Maxerai and Asnoetoi: 12 cities.¹⁵¹

(xi) The region of Margania which is to the east of the former places:¹⁵² seven cities.¹⁵³

(xii) The region of the Bactrians to the east of the former: 17 cities, the royal city of which is Bactria.¹⁵⁴

(xiii) The region of Sogdiana to the south of the former, where they live in the mountains: ten cities, two of which are named for Alexander.¹⁵⁵

(xiv) The region of Sakkon to the east of the former: the Akaritai, the Komaroi, the Komédai, the Sagetai, the Garai and the Turnai.¹⁵⁶

(xv) The region of Scythia in the Isimon mountains to the north of the former, as far as the uninhabited land. In this land there is a large nation, and rugged mountains, and two cities where they consume milk.¹⁵⁷

(xvi) Inner Scythia, whose northern boundary extends¹⁵⁸ to the uninhabited land, where they eat horses: [211] they have 40 cities.¹⁵⁹

(xvii) The region of Seurikos to the east of the Scythians: 16 cities; and in the northern part of this land the people are cannibals.¹⁶⁰

(xviii) The region of Aria, to the east of the former: 35 cities, and here is a country of the Antymandrians that is filled with scorpions.¹⁶¹

(xix) Paropanisadon to the southeast of the former: 16 cities.¹⁶²

(xx) The region of Dagiana: eleven cities.¹⁶³

(xxi) The region of Arachosia: twelve cities.¹⁶⁴

151 Cf. Ptol. vi.9, Hyrcania. Ptol. 9.5 places the Maxêrai and Astabênnoi by the sea. For 'Asnoetoi' Add. 14,620 has 'Asotenoi'.

152 Add. 14,620: 'former (place)'; from here on a section has dropped out of Add. 14,620.

153 Cf. Ptol. vi.10, Margiana.

154 Cf. Ptol. vi.11, Bactriana. At 11.9 Ptol. refers to Baktra basileion.

155 Cf. Ptol. vi.12, Sogdiana, 12.6 for the reference to two Alexandrias.

156 Cf. Ptol. vi.13, Sakai, 13.3 for the tribes beyond the river Jaxartes - the Karatai, Komaroi, Komédai, Massagetai, Grinaioi Scythians, Toornai and Byltai. On the name Toornai see Land 1887, 173.

157 Cf. Ptol. vi.14, Scythia up to the Imaus mountains, 14.12 for the reference to the Galactophagoi, milk-consumers.

158 If the text is sound, the grammar is uncertain, cf. PZT ii, 142 n.7.

159 Cf. Ptol. vi.15, Scythia beyond the Imaus mountains, 15.3 on the horse-eating (Hippophagoi) Scythians.

160 Cf. Ptol. vi.16, Serikê, i.e. China, 16.4 for cannibals in the north.

161 Cf. Ptol. vi.17, Areia (Herat), 17.3 for the Etymandroi, and below them, the scorpion-bearing country.

162 Cf. Ptol. vi.18, Paropanisadai (central Afghanistan).

163 Cf. Ptol. vi.19, Drangiana (Sistan).

164 Cf. Ptol. vi.20, Arachosia (Kandahar).

(xxii) The region of Gerdos: twelve cities.¹⁶⁵

The conclusion of these nations.

h. (i) Outer India: 202 cities. The cities of the king: Kottis,¹⁶⁶ Odenus Artacum, Gange, Wathana, Wanedqur, Akaros, Midura, Orthura;¹⁶⁷ nine cities, and their king. There are the Sardon Mountains from where comes sardon (carnelian). From the city of Gognaba to the east live wise men who are naked,¹⁶⁸ and beyond them the Hanikai, Prasiakoi, and Sabaroi;¹⁶⁹ and from the Sardon Mountains to the south to the land of Tighun, this is controlled by the Tabasoi, magian sorcerers,¹⁷⁰ and the Boligai and Porurai. Beyond them are the Mandalai,¹⁷¹ and from the Boțana' Mountains as far as the wild people are the Brahmans, and their city is Kramai;¹⁷² and beyond them are the Madiaminoi, the Diluphinnitai, the Kokkognagai and the Sabai, where diamonds are produced.¹⁷³

(ii) Inner India: 65 cities. Their chief city is Ganata'.¹⁷⁴ From their land comes silver, and below them are the Byseginai who are cannibals,¹⁷⁵ and beyond [212] them are the Marurai, and to their north the Korankalai and

165 Cf. Ptol. vi.21, Gedrosia (Beluchistan).

166 Syriac *qtys*, which we suppose to be Ptol.'s Kottis at vii.1.14, although there seems to be no reason to associate this place with the king (unlike the others); it could also be Ptol.'s Konta (vii.1.51).

167 Cf. Ptol vii.1, India up to the Ganges. Ptol.'s Ozênê basileion Tiastanou (1.63), Arkatou basileion Sôra (1.68), Gangê basileion (1.81), Baithana basileion Siritolemaiou (1.82), Hippokoura, basileion Baleokourou (1.83), Karoura, basileion Kêrobothrou (1.86), Modoura, basileion Pandionos (1.89), Orthoura (Syr. '*atrurê*'), basileion Sôrnagos (1.91).

168 Ptol. vii.1.20 on Mount Sardonyx, from where the stone comes, 1.50–1 on the city Kognandaba, east of which lie the Gymnosophists (naked sages).

169 Ptol. vii.1.52 for the Nanikhai, 1.53, Prasiakê, 1.54, Saudra batis (Sauarabatis).

170 Ptol. vii.1.65 states that between Mt Sardonyx and the Bêtigo (Syr. *bet tigun*) mountains live the Tabasoi, a nation of sorcerers.

171 Ptol. vii.1.69 for the Biolingai (or Bôlingai), 1.70 the Pôrouaroi, 1.72 the Mandalai (Syr. *ma'dalê*).

172 According to Ptol. vii.1.74, the Brahmans live between the Bêtigo mountains and Batoi. Their city in Ptol. is Brakhmê; PZ's Kramai is the result of the easy b/k confusion in Syriac.

173 Cf. Ptol. vii.1.75, the Badiamaioi, 1.76, the Drilophyllitai, 1.77, the Kokkonagai, 1.80, the Sabarai, the source of much adamantine.

174 Cf. Ptol. vii.2, India beyond the Ganges. At 2.7 he refers to Kortatha métropolis.

175 Ptol. vii.2.17 refers to the silver-bearing country, beyond which lie the Bêsyngetai and a gold-bearing land; PZ's source has confused these with the cannibalistic Tamêrai (Gamêrai) mentioned at 2.16.

Pagasasai, who are short, hairy, have wide faces and are white.¹⁷⁶ Beyond them are the nation of the Gamirai, among whom there is excellent malabathron and who are cannibals; they are short, hairy, white, and flat-nosed, and from them are brought up silver and gold.¹⁷⁷ Beyond them are the Aninakhai and beyond them a people who are naked,¹⁷⁸ and to the north of them the Kakobai and Basanai, from where much copper comes. From there until the Great Gulf are the Kadutai, among whom are many leopards and elephants; their homes are in caves and they make their bodies like a hippopotamus, which an arrow cannot penetrate, and it is here where Mariconite nard is made.¹⁷⁹ Prigylipum is the royal city in which are bearded chickens¹⁸⁰ and white crows, and parrots.¹⁸¹ Lina is an island from where many pearls are brought up, and its inhabitants are naked.¹⁸² Beyond them are three islands of cannibals,¹⁸³ and another five islands which are called Sabariboi, [whose inhabitants]¹⁸⁴ are cannibals, and another island from which gold comes.¹⁸⁵ Satyron¹⁸⁶ is an island whose inhabitants have tails; they do not put metal in

176 Cf. Ptol. vii.2.14 for the Maroundai, 2.15 the Korankaloi and Passalai. PZ's description is applied by Ptol. to the Tiladai, however.

177 PZ's Gamirai are Ptol.'s Tamêrai or Gamêrai (vii.2.16), who inhabit a malabathron-bearing region. On malabathron see Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 737 n.123, who identify it tentatively with cinnamon; it is in fact probably the leaves of *Cinnamomum tejpata* (Lauraceae), having a flavour like cassia. The description of the people is again wrongly applied, since in Ptol. it refers to the inhabitants of the gold-bearing region (2.17). As noted above, the Tamêrai (Gamêrai) are said to be cannibals.

178 Cf. Ptol. vii.2.18 for the Aninakhai and the Nangalogai, who are naked.

179 Cf. Ptol. vii.2.19 on the border with China, with the Kakobai to the north and Basanaroi to the south, 2.20 on the copper-bearing region, below which, as far as the Great Gulf, live the Koudoutai; 2.21. Ptol. states that members of this people look like wild animals, live in caves and have a skin like that of hippopotami; hence it cannot be penetrated by arrows. The last phrase is a misunderstanding of Ptol. vii.2.23, where he refers to Rhandamarkotta (Rhandamarta is a variant), where there is nard, i.e. a valerian plant from the Himalayas, whose roots and flowers were prized for their smell and were used in medicine. See Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 729 n.127. Cf. Ptol. vii.2.21 on the animals of the region.

180 Referring to a breed of chicken with plumage below the beak, such as bantam varieties native to Belgium.

181 Ptol. vii.2.23 refers to Triglyphon, also known as Trilingon, basileion, in which these exotic birds are found.

182 Cf. Ptol. vii.2.26 refers to the island Khalinê, from which come pearls and where the inhabitants go around in the nude.

183 Cf. Ptol. vii.2.27 on the cannibals (Anthrophagoi) called Sindai.

184 Omitted from Syriac. Cf. Ptol. vii.2.28 on the five Barousai islands, whose inhabitants are cannibals.

185 Ptol. vii.2.29 refers to Iabadiou, a gold-bearing island.

186 So Ptolemy; Syriac: 'wn.

their ships and they are cannibals, called Maniklai.¹⁸⁷

(iii) Sinon, a region of India: nine cities without walls, to the east towards the interior as far as uninhabited land. The Semanothinoi occupy the region to the north, and after them are the Aspithrai and Ambastai, and those who eat fish.¹⁸⁸ Mount Rawa'a is there, where the Saṭiraupan live.¹⁸⁹ Further in [213] from them, to the south, is the large island of Probaus, whose women are deaf, and emeralds are mined by them, as well as beryl, hyacinth, and every kind of stones, and there are herds of elephants. Anugira is the royal city of the great island,¹⁹⁰ and there are islands found opposite it, having 30 and 16 cities.¹⁹¹

i. Hear now the brief and summary [description of] the borders of human habitation: towards the unexplored land of the east, and again the countries of the Serirkū,¹⁹² and towards the south is again an unexplored land, which includes the territory of India; and towards the west is again an uninhabited land, which includes the gulf of the Ethiopians, as far as the ocean in which is the island of Artania, and as far as Sarmatia, and as far as an unexplored land which borders on the Sarmatians, the Scythians, and Sericans.¹⁹³

j. This account of the nations of the world, as written by us above, came about through the diligence of Ptolemy Philometor, in the 30th year of his reign, 150 years before the birth of our Saviour; so that from that time until today, the year 28 of the reign of the serene emperor Justinian of our time, the year 866 of Alexander, and the 333rd Olympiad, will be found to be 711

187 Ptol. vii.2.30 refers to three islands of Satyroi, who have tails; at 2.31 he describes the Maniolai islands, whose inhabitants do not use iron and where cannibals called Maniolai live.

188 Cf. Ptol. vii.3, Sinôn, i.e. south-east China, whose northernmost people are the Sēmanthinoi (3.4); Ptol. also mentions here the Aspithrai, the Ambastai and the Fish-eaters (Ichthyophagoi).

189 Ptol. vii.3.2 refers to the city of Rhavana and the Cape of the Satyroi, which seems to have become very garbled here.

190 Ptol. vii.4, Taprobane, i.e. Sri Lanka. Ptol. 4.1 claims that the men tie back their hair like women, which has somehow been distorted in the tradition to the point that PZ believes instead that the women are deaf, cf. HB 327. Ananias of Shirak, on the other hand, remains closer to Ptol.: see Hewsens 1992, 76A with 269 n.227A. The list of resources produced by the island is also from Ptol. 4.1. On beryl and hyacinth (probably a reference to sapphires) see Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 715 n.92, 735 n.150. At 4.10 Ptol. refers to Anourogrammon basileion.

191 Sic.

192 I.e. land of silk. Ptol. distinguishes between the Seres and the Sinoi, although both refer (approximately) to China. See Stückelberger and Grasshoff 2006, 91 n.83.

193 Ptol. vii.5 offers a summary of his conclusions, 5.2 on the bounds of the inhabited world. PZ's Aretania is in error for Ptol.'s Britain. We have translated Syr. *men* as 'towards', although strictly it means 'from', in order to make the section comprehensible. It is in essence a compressed version of Ptol. vii.5.2.

years.¹⁹⁴ In such a span of time, how many cities were built and added to all the nations in the world from [the time of] Philometor until today, especially after the birth of our Saviour! Peace has reigned among the nations, [214] races, and languages, and they have not kept their former custom, with [one] people rising up against another in battles and with swords, fighting in battle, in that the prophecy has been fulfilled in them which says, 'They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks.'¹⁹⁵

k.¹⁹⁶ (i) Along with them also in this northern region are five believing nations, who have 24 bishops, and a *catholicos* in Dvin, a large city in Persian Armenia. The name of their *catholicos* was Gregory, a righteous and renowned man.¹⁹⁷

(ii) Gurzan is a country in Armenia, and its language is like Greek, and they have a Christian prince who is subject to the king of Persia.¹⁹⁸

194 Jerome, *Chron.* 143 does indeed equate the 30th year of Ptolemy Philometor with 150 B.C., at least by Helm's calculations. The 28th year of Justinian is 554/5, as is also AG 866. The 333rd Olympiad lasted from 553 to 556. The absence of an indiction year indicates that PZ probably derives this synchronism from a different source than usual. We would therefore expect a figure of 705 rather than 711 years for the elapse of time since the supposed production of Ptolemy's work (150 B.C. to 554/5, inclusive) and Land 1887, 179, therefore proposes just such an emendation.

195 The quotation is from Isaiah 2.4. The upbeat tone of this passage is in stark contrast to the gloomy tone of xii.4–5, but the conversion of foreign peoples was viewed as a precursor of the last judgement: see Magdalino 1993, 5–6. It is true that by 554/5 the war in Italy had been concluded, cf. Stein 1949, 605–11, and hostilities on the eastern frontier had largely petered out, cf. Greatrex and Lieu 2002, 123–30.

196 The section that follows here is that described by Czeglédý 1971, 137–45, as PZ's 'Supplement'. He argues that some information is derived from Greek sources (e.g. the reference to the Amazons), while other elements stem from Persian sources (e.g. the reference to Albania as 'Arran', the name used in Middle Persian). PZ displays a remarkable familiarity with the Caucasus region, with which he is here concerned. An almost precisely contemporary account of the region is provided by Proc. *Wars* viii.1–6, cf. also Th. Sim. vii.7.6–9.12. It is likely that at least part of his information stems from John of Resh'aina (see n.223 below). The five believing peoples are those listed here, i.e. the Armenians, the Iberians/Georgians, the Albanians, Sisakan and Bazgun. See maps 7 and 8 for attempts to plot the peoples described.

197 The first Armenian *catholicos* was Gregory the Illuminator, who converted Armenia to Christianity in the early fourth century (the precise dates are unclear). It is probably to him that PZ is referring. See Chaumont 1986, 426–7, Garsoïan 1989, 375–6, Garsoïan 1999, 1–7, Hewsén 2001, 72. The seat of the *catholicos* was transferred in 484 from Aštišat to Dvin: see Garsoïan 1999, 161, Hewsén 2001, 75. The figure of 24 bishops from throughout the Caucasus is attested twice for councils in the sixth century, both at Dvin: see Garsoïan 1999, 163 (council of 505/6), 211 (that of 555); other figures are also attested, as Garsoïan notes.

198 On Gurzan, i.e. Iberia/Georgia, which lay in the central Transcaucasus region, see Braund 1994, 268–314. Although the country sometimes fell under Armenian control, this was certainly

(iii) Arran is a country in the territory of Armenia, with its own language, a believing and baptised nation, and they have a prince who is subject to the king of Persia.¹⁹⁹

(iv) Sisagan is a country with its own language and a believing people, and pagans dwell in it.²⁰⁰

(v) Balasagan is a country with its own language that extends and reaches to the Caspian Gates and the sea,²⁰¹ [that is] those [Gates and sea]

not the case in the sixth century; its church was, however, subordinate to the Armenian *catholicos* until the end of the century. See Lang 1983, 520–3, Garsoïan 1989, 500–1, Hewsen 1992, 128–30 n.18. The Georgian language is not Indo-European and bears no resemblance to Greek.

199 In the first century A.D., 26 different languages are attested in Albania, see Strabo xi.4.6. Clearly one had come to predominate by the fifth century, at which point Maštoc invented an alphabet for it, see Mos. Khor. ii.3, Koriwn, V. *Maštoc*‘, 112–13 with Winkler 1994, 340–8, Marquart 1901, 117 and Garsoïan 1989, 438–9; both passages are translated by Mahé and Aleksidzé 1997, 530. By the sixth century the Albanian language was in decline, and few traces in inscriptions have been found: see Hewsen 1964, Akopjan 1987, 138–9. In the 1990s, however, manuscripts in Albanian were discovered at St Catherine’s monastery in Sinai: see Mahé and Aleksidzé 1997, Alexidze and Blair 2003 and now Gippert et al. 2009.

PZ uses the Iranian term for the kingdom here (as at vii.4d); the name itself is connected with the word Iran, cf. Land 1887, 180 n.4. The kingdom lay on the eastern side of the Caucasus, adjoining the Caspian Sea. There was a break in the monarchy in the fifth century, but it was reestablished under the Persian king Balash (484–8); it may have been suppressed again c.510. Even after its restoration, however, real power lay in the hands of the Persian *marzban* (governor) installed at Partaw. See Chaumont 1985, 808–9, Garsoïan, *loc. cit.*, Hewsen 1992, 141–3 n.65, van Esbroeck 2001, Hewsen 2001, 80.

200 Sisagan (Siwnik‘ in Armenian) was the ninth region of Greater Armenia, whose inhabitants claimed descent from a legendary Sisak: see Adontz 1970, 172–3, Garsoïan 1989, 490–1, Hewsen 1992, 189–92 n.189, 234 n.6, Hewsen 2001, 89. The region retained a separate identity despite its central location within Armenia, just south of Lake Sevan, which would explain why PZ distinguishes it from Armenia here. Proc. *Wars* i.15.1 likewise distinguishes the Sunitae from the Armenians, see Greatrex 1998, 186 n.43. Hewsen 1992, 234 n.6, suggests that its language, alluded to here by PZ, might be related to Albanian, cf. Marquart 1901, 120–1.

201 PZT ii, 214, reads Bazgun, which appears to refer to the Abasgi, i.e. Abkhaz, so (e.g.) Marquart 1903, 174, Czeglédy 1971, 138, Dickens 2008, 212. For the forms of the name see Toumanoff 1963, 60; on the Abasgi generally see (e.g.) Braund 1994, 279, 300–1, who deals with their incorporation into the Roman empire under Justinian. Yet the geographical description, including the reference to the Caspian Gates and the sea (which could refer either to the Black Sea or the Caspian), is odd; furthermore, the order in which PZ places the peoples is also, as Maricq and Honigmann 1953, 82–4, note, from west to east. Hewsen 2001, 89 map 68 (based on PZ’s information here) places Bazgun just to the east of the Caspian Sea, cf. idem 1992, 120 n.99, where he identifies PZ’s Bazgun with Ananias’ Bagank‘, a district of Albania, cf. already Land 1887, 181. Alemany 2000, 393 n.21 and Honigmann and Maricq 1963, 82–4 (cf. Kettenhofen 1995, 16 n.102) arrived at the same conclusion independently, which should be accepted: both emend the text to read *blzgun* (as in Balâsagân) rather than *bzgun*, so too Adontz 1970, 171. This has been adopted in our translation.

of the territory of the Huns.²⁰² They [are situated] next to them and extend as far as them [the Huns].

(vi) Beyond these same gates are the Burgar, a pagan and barbarian people with their own language, and they have cities.²⁰³

(vii) There are the Alans, who have five cities.²⁰⁴

(viii) There are the people of the region of Dadu, who live in the mountains and have fortresses.²⁰⁵

(ix) There are the Onogur, a tent-dwelling people;²⁰⁶ the Ogur

202 Against what Marquart 1903, 174, argues, 'in the territory of the Huns' should not be taken with what follows rather than with what precedes. So HB 328, Maricq and Honigmann 1953, 83. We follow Dickens 2008, 20 with n.154, in translating Syr. *lgaw* as 'beyond' rather than 'as far as'.

203 The Bulgars (from the Turkic *bulğla*, meaning a 'mix', or, according to Golden 1992, 104, 'disturbers' [of others]) comprised a grouping of related Turkic peoples who were settled in the Urals. First attested in 480, they later moved westwards to become a formidable opponent of the Byzantines. See Golden 1990, 258, Hewsens 1992, 110 n.18, Moravcsik 1958, 100–6, Dickens 2008, 22, noting that this is one of the earliest mentions of this people.

204 The Alans were an Iranian tribe, a branch of whom established itself in western Europe, while the rest remained in the northern Caucasus region, in the vicinity of the Dariel pass, which takes its name from them. See Alemany 2000, 1–5 on the name, 393–4 on PZ; Savvides 2003, 41–4 offers a brief account of the Alans in the sixth century, cf. also Arzhantseva 2007. Mich. Syr. x.21 (381–2b/363–4), in the context of a mythical account of the journey of three eponymous brothers towards the Roman empire, refers to two of them moving 'to the land of the Alans, which is called Barsalia [see n.215 below on this term], whose cities had been built by the Romans and together made up the area of Qaspiya, also called "The Gate of the Turaye", then inhabited by the Pugaraye.' (tr. Alemany 2000, 392). See Marquart 1903, 489–90, on possible (albeit dubious) evidence for Roman involvement in city-building; the reference in Mich. Syr. to 'The Gate of the Turaye', i.e. the Tzur or Derbent pass, is also suspect, since the Alans are usually placed in the central or western Caucasus region, not in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea.

205 AK 382 identify the Dadu with the Didoykh in Ps.-Moses Khorenats'i, i.e. Ananias of Shirak, tr. Hewsens 1992, 55A and 57. Alemany 2000, 394 n.22, identifies the Dido with the Lesghians or Lakz (Arabic al-Dudaniyah), cf. Miquel 1975, 260 n.4 with the map at 261. Land 1887, 182–3, places this people in modern Dagestan and argues that PZ might be referring to Daroi, rather than Dadoi (the 'd' and 'r' looking very alike in Syriac), a people placed north of the Dariel pass by Men. Prot. frg.10.5, line 17 (where he refers to Dareinê) cf. Blockley 1985, 266 n.149. Dickens 2008, 22–3, following Hewsens 1992, suggests that both Ananias' and PZ's references to the Dadu may ultimately go back to Ptolemy's Dadoi or Didoi (i.e. the Didouroi of v.9.22, cf. Pliny, *HN* vi.11.29), although there is otherwise little trace of Ptol. in this section. We are grateful to Robert Hewsens for advice on this people.

206 This list of thirteen tent-dwelling, i.e. nomadic, peoples is analysed in detail by Czeglédý 1971, 137–45. He proposes that the names should be rendered as Onogur, Ogur, Sabir, Burgar, Khu(r)turgur, Avar, Khasir, (I)di(r)mar, Saru(r)gur, Barsilq (?), Khwalis, Abdel, Ephthalit; cf. already Marquart 1903, 356 n.1. Czeglédý also argues, 141, that the reference to Ogurs, Onoguri, Saraguri, Sabirs and Avars must derive, perhaps indirectly, from Priscus,

[people],²⁰⁷ the Sabir,²⁰⁸ the Burgar,²⁰⁹ the Korthrigor,²¹⁰ the Avar,²¹¹ the

who is the only other source to mention all of them (frg.40); in this fragment (from 462/3, cf. Blockley 1981, 121, Golden 1992, 97) Priscus describes how envoys from the Saraguri, Urogi (Ogurs) and Onoguri came to the Romans, having been pushed out of their territory by the encroachments of the Sabirs, who had in turn been driven west by the Avars; see also Golden 1990b, 257, Dickens 2008, 23. Czeglédý suggests Eustathius of Epiphania as an intermediary source. Given the fragmentary nature of our sources, however, the coincidence of names is hardly sufficient to warrant such an inference; as will be noted below, Th. Sim. also refers to several of them in the seventh century. Jord. *Get.* v.35–8 (p.63) offers an interesting parallel view of the area between the Danube and the Caucasus c.550. Zuckerman 2007, 401, points out that these thirteen peoples occupy a region extending well beyond the Caucasus: he argues that they are situated in Ptolemy's Asian Sarmatia, from the Caucasus range to the sources of the Kama, a tributary of the Volga, i.e. covering much of present-day Ukraine. Kralidis 2003, 39, is unduly dismissive of PZ's information, claiming that it is merely derivative of Byzantine sources.

The name Onogur/Unnogur means 'Ten Ogurs': see Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 438, Golden 1990b, 257. See also Moravcsik 1958, 219–20, Haussig 1953, 363–4, Golden 1990b, 259, Golden 1992, 100–3. They were known as traders in marten-skins, cf. Jord. *Get.* v.37 (p.63), but were conquered by the Avars in the late sixth century; see further n.215 below (on the Barsêlt). Their name is preserved in the name of Hungary: see Sinor 1946–7, 66.

207 Ogurs (or Oghurs): A term meaning 'grouping of kindred tribes' or 'tribal union', cf. Golden 1990b, 257–8, Golden 2007, 15, Dickens 2008, 23; the Ogurs, along with the Onoguri and Saraguri, originated in western Siberia and the Kazakh steppes. See further Moravcsik 1958, 227–8. Th. Sim. vii.7.13 reports that the Ogur were subdued by the Avars in the late sixth century.

208 Their name and origins remain unclear: see Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 440–1, cf. Sinor 1946–7, 15–29, Moravcsik 1958, 262–3, Golden 1992, 104–6, Dickens 2008, 24. They occupied the central Caucasus region in the late fifth century, displacing the Onoguri, Ogurs and Saraguri to the north: see Haussig 1953, 364–5, Hewsén 1992, 124 n.111. They are associated by Jordanes with the Onoguri, probably because they lived in close proximity to one another, so Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 432, cf. Th. Sim. vii.8.3. They were frequently used as allies by Romans and Persians in their wars during the sixth century: see Sinor 1990a, 200, Golden 1990b, 259–60. See also n.228 below (on Probus).

209 Just above (see n.203) PZ refers to the Bulgars as sedentary, and so this reference is puzzling, as HB 328 n.4 note. Agath. v.11.2 refers to Burugundi in this region, alongside Kutrigurs, Utigurs and Ultizurs; they had disappeared, however, by Agathias' day (11.4). The reference might therefore be to this people, as HB suggest, but uncertainty remains, cf. Dickens 2008, 25.

210 Proc. *Wars* viii.5.2 calls this people the Kutrigurs; they occupied the lands between the Don and the Dnieper and undertook an extensive raid of the Balkan territories, reaching as far as Constantinople, in 559, on which see Agath. v.11–23 with Evans 1996, 253–5 and Meier 2003a, 249. See also Moravcsik 1958, 171–2, Czeglédý 1971, 142, Golden 1990b, 458, Golden 1992, 99–100. According to Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 438, the name is Turkish, while Haussig 1953, 430, derives it from the Altaic word 'Qurt', meaning a wolf or a worm; cf. Dickens 2008, 24, for other suggestions.

211 This people, driven west by the expansion of the Turks, entered into contact with Constantinople in January 558 for the first time, having moved into the Caucasus area from the

Khasir,²¹² the Dirmar,²¹³ the Sarurgur,²¹⁴ the Bagarsik,²¹⁵ the Khulas,²¹⁶ the Abdel, the Ephthalite:²¹⁷ these thirteen nations are tent-dwellers, living on

east; they are first mentioned, however, by Priscus (frg.40). They soon overcame the Sabirs and moved further west, defeating the Kutrigurs and Utigurs in the Ukraine. They grew to become a serious rival to Roman power in the region, culminating in their siege of Constantinople in 626. See Men. Prot. frg.8, Szádeczky-Kardoss 1990, Golden 1990b, 260, Evans 1996, 260–1; also Moravcsik 1958, 51–3, Haussig 1953, 329–32 (on the name).

212 PZ's Khasir (*khsr*) is probably a rendering of Akatziri or Kotzirs, so Czeglédý 1971, 143–5, arguing that the deformation is the result of the name coming through a Middle Persian source. On the Akatziri see Priscus frgs.40, 47 (from the 460s, see Blockley 1981, 121), who describes their defeat at the hands of the Saraguri and their invasion of Persian territory in the mid-fifth century; cf. Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 427–38, Sinor 1946–7, 1–4, Sinor 1990a, 200. On the name see Moravcsik 1958, 58–9, 346–7. Czeglédý 1971, 143–4, probably rightly rejects efforts that have been made to see here a reference to the Khazars; Zuckerman 2007, 401, however, accepts the link, cf. 426. See Dickens 2008, 25–8, for a detailed analysis of this question, concluding by citing a letter of P. Golden, according to which 'what may lurk behind *ksr* remains problematic' (28 n.217); cf. Golden 2007, 15–17.

213 Czeglédý 1971, 142, identifies this people with Priscus' Itimaroi (frg.1.19, 2.1); the shift from a 't' to a 'd' may be explained if we suppose that PZ was relying on a Middle Persian version of a Greek text, a path of transmission paralleled by the *Alexander Romance*, cf. Gerö 1993, 5, following Nöldeke 1890, 14–17. See also Moravcsik 1958, 142.

214 The name probably means 'white' or 'yellow' Ogurs, so Golden 1990b, 258, Dickens 2008, 23. On the Saraguri's first contact with the Romans see n.206 above. On forms of the name see Moravcsik 1958, 267–8. Czeglédý 1971, 142, argues that the extra 'r's found in PZ's renderings of the Kutrigurs, Itimaroi and Saraguri are to be ascribed to the mediation of a Middle Persian source.

215 Th. Sim. vii.8.3 refers to the Barsêlt, to whom PZ is surely here referring (although his reading is somewhat off the mark); so Marquart 1903, 356, Miyakawa and Kollautz 1968, 89. Markwart 1924, 328, proposed to identify them with the Zali mentioned by Men. Prot. (frg. 5.2), interpreting the reference as being to (Bar)zali; the fragment concerns the Avar conquest of the Onoguri, Zali and Sabirs in the late 550s. Maenchen-Helfen 1973, 440, rejects the identification as 'highly hypothetical'. They were situated north of the Derbent pass, cf. Marquart 1903, 490, Alemany 2000, 393. See also Moravcsik 1958, 87, Golden 1990a, 235–6, Dickens 2008, 24–5.

216 Men. Prot. frg.10.3 refers to the Kholiatai, cf. Marquart 1901, 253. They are probably the same people as the Kolch whose defeat at the hands of the Avars is reported by Th. Sim. at vii.8.6. See also Haussig 1953, 425 n.584, Moravcsik 1958, 345, Miyakawa and Kollautz 1968, 89. Another possible identification is with the Khwarazmians, Gk. *Khoulês*, west of the Volga: see Moravcsik 1958, 347, Dickey 2008, 28–9.

217 Th. Sim. vii.7.8 likewise juxtaposes the two names: both appear to be used for essentially the same people. On this clearly inadequate basis, Czeglédý 1971, 142, infers that Th. Sim. and PZ derived their notices from the same source, Eustathius of Epiphania. The Hephthalites were a tribe that dominated much of Central Asia from the late fifth century to the 560s, when their power was broken by the Avars: see Miyakawa and Kollautz 1968, Sinor 1990b, 298–301. On the names see Haussig 1953, 323–7, Moravcsik 1958, 54, 127–8; on their meaning see Hewsen 1992, 346, Litvinsky 1996, 135. Whether they can rightly be described as tent-dwelling, i.e.

the meat of cattle, fish, and wild animals and by weapons.²¹⁸

(x) Beyond them are the Pygmies and the Dog-men,²¹⁹ and to the west and north of them are the Amazons, women with one [215] breast each who live entirely by themselves and fight with weapons and horses. There is no male among them. When they wish to copulate they go peacefully to a people near their country and have intercourse with them for a month of days, and they return to their country. When they give birth, if it is a male they kill him, but if it is a female they let her live, and thus they perpetuate their ranks.²²⁰

(xi) The nation surrounding them is the Harus, tall, big-limbed men, who have no weapons, and horses cannot carry them because of their stocky size.²²¹

(xii) To the east, on the northern outskirts, are three black tribes.²²²

nomadic, is uncertain, since both Proc. (*Wars* i.3.3) and Men. Prot. (frg.10.1, 77–8) clearly distinguish them from nomadic peoples, insisting that they were settled; the Chinese sources are more ambiguous, see Miyakawa and Kollautz 1968, 109–12, Litvinsky 1996, 144–5.

218 Or ‘provisions’, cf. Dickens 2008, 21 n.155.

219 PZ moves into the realm of the fantastic here; his source was probably the Syriac *Alexander Romance*, 265/152, cf. Solomon of Basra, *The Book of the Bee*, 146/128. See Marquart 1903, 357, Alemany 2000, 394, Dudko 2001–2, 83–6. The Syriac translation of the *Romance* certainly existed by the mid-sixth century, as Czeglédý 1957, 240, establishes, although the version in which it survives is dated by Gerö 1993, 5, to the end of the century; the work was moreover a product of the region around Amida, as certain details attest, cf. Czeglédý 1957, 245. Land 1887, 184–5, connects the Dog-men with the Kynêtes of Hdt. iv.49, although this is clearly not PZ’s direct source. On later references to Dog-men in Syriac literature see Dickens 2008, 127.

220 The Amazons were traditionally placed in the Caucasus region from Herodotus’ day, if not earlier. See Herodotus iv.110–15, Strabo 11.5.1; cf. Proc. *Wars* viii.3.5–11, who takes these stories seriously and refers to Strabo. As Marquart 1903, 357, cf. D’yakonov 1939, 84, notes, PZ’s account diverges from that of the *Alexander Romance*, in which the Amazons do not appear as a separate people but are treated rather as the wives of the Huns. He suggests therefore that both go back instead to a common source. Alternatively, PZ may here be relying on a Greek source that drew on the earlier classical tradition concerning the Amazons. On references to Amazons in late antique and Byzantine literature generally see Witek 2001, 293–5.

221 The Harus have sometimes been equated with the Rus, i.e. Russians, which would make this the first reference to this people in history, so Marquart 1903, 354–5, Pigulevskaya 1952, 47–8; more far-fetched theories are rejected by D’yakonov 1939. Land 1887, 185, saw rather an allusion to the god Ares, sometimes associated with the Amazons. Czeglédý 1961, 242–4, cf. idem 1971, 139, however clearly shows that the reference is rather to the red-haired people – Red Giants – mentioned in the Greek and Arabic versions of the *Alexander Romance*, Rhousios in Greek. The name seems to have come to PZ through a Middle Persian intermediary, which led to the unusual ‘hr’ combination, rather than ‘rh’, which is the normal way of transcribing the Greek rho, cf. Czeglédý 1971, 139; D’yakonov 1939, 87, preferred to derive it from the Greek *hoi Rôds* (‘the Rus’), on the other hand.

222 The black tribes also feature in some versions of the *Alexander Romance* in the vicinity

l. In the land of the Huns twenty or more years ago some people translated books into their language, and I will recount the circumstance which the Lord brought about, as I heard it from some truthful men – John of Resh‘aina, who was in the monastery of Bet Isḥaqûnî, on the outskirts of Amida, and Thomas the Tanner. They were taken into captivity by Kavadh fifty or more years ago, then when they entered Persia they were sold again to the Huns, and they went out from the gates, and were in that land more than thirty years.²²³ They took wives and made families there. After about this length time they returned and recounted their lives to us in their own words as follows.

m. After the arrival of the captives from the land of the Romans whom the Huns had brought in, and who were in their land 34 years, an angel appeared to someone named Qardust, the bishop of the region of Arran,²²⁴ as the bishop told it, and said to him, ‘Go out with three pious priests to the plain and receive from me the reports that have been sent to you from the Lord of spirits, because I have authority over these captives who have gone into the nations from the land of the Romans, and have offered their petition to God, and he told me [216] what to say to you.’ This Qardust (meaning in Greek ‘Theoclétus’ and in Aramaic,²²⁵ ‘Called by God’) went diligently out into the plain, with the three priests, because the angel said to them, ‘Come, go into the territory of the nations, and baptise the children of the dead, and

of the Red Giants: see Czeglédý 1971, 139; the reference may go back eventually to Herodotus (iv.100–2), who mentions the Melanchlanoi (black-cloaked) tribes in the same area.

223 PZ now turns to oral sources for the information that follows: this is the third part of the appendix in the analysis of Czeglédý 1971, discussed by him at 145–8. John of Resh‘aina (Theodosiopolis) is not otherwise attested; nor is Thomas the tanner; on the monastery see PZ viii n.117. They were captured by Kavadh during his invasion of Roman territory of 502–503 and evidently returned to Amida in the mid-550s. See Czeglédý 1971, 145 and PZ vii.4 above on the capture of Amida. As Pigulevskaya 1969, 201, notes, there is a minor chronological problem here with the dating of the translation of the bible into Hunnic: PZ dates it here to twenty years before the time of writing, i.e. 535, yet below the mission of Qardust, who produced the translation, is dated to 34 years after the capture of John and his fellow citizens, i.e. 537. AK 254 n.1 gratuitously emend the text from 34 years to 3 or 4 years; Land 1887, 188, proposed emending from 34 years to 24, which would place Qardust’s mission in 527 and connect it with Probus’ visit to the Caucasus (on which see n.228 below).

224 Qardust, as HB 329 note, means in Armenian ‘summoned by God’, i.e. the Greek Theoclétus (see below). He was a bishop of Albania and is not otherwise attested. Given that large numbers of Christians were probably now living in Hunnic territory to the north of the Caucasus, such a mission is certainly plausible. Both Albanians and captives were Miaphysites. See Thompson 1946, 77, Czeglédý 1971, 146.

225 Supplied from PZV ii, 216 n.2, which has this reconstruction from Hoffmann.

make priests for them, and give them the mysteries, and encourage them, for I am with you, and I will bring to you graces, and you will perform signs there among the nations. Everything that you require for your ministry you will find there.' Four others went with them, and, in a country where no peace is found, these seven priests found lodging from one evening to the next, seven loaves and a jug of water. They did not enter through the gates, but they were guided over the mountains.²²⁶ When they arrived, they spoke with the captives and many of the Huns were baptised and became disciples. They were there a week of years, and there they translated books into the language of the Huns.²²⁷

n. At that time it happened that Probus was sent there on an embassy from the emperor to hire some of them to engage in war with the nations. When he learned about these saints from the Huns and was informed by the captives, he became eager and excited to see them. He saw them and was blessed by them, and he greatly honoured them in the sight of these nations. When our emperor learned from him the situation that was written above, that the Lord had acted thus, he caused thirty mules to be loaded by the administration of the Roman cities that were near, and sent them with flour, wine, and oil, garments and other wares and sacred vessels. He gave them the animals as a gift, because Probus was a believing and kind man.²²⁸

o. [217] Another Armenian bishop, whose name was Macarius,²²⁹ was inspired by such virtue and went out to him after two more weeks of years, and being honorably moved went of his own accord with some of his priests to the country and built a brick church, planted plants, and sowed various kinds of seeds. He performed signs and baptised many. When the authorities

226 Czeglédy 1971, 146, suggests that the priests crossed the mountains rather than go through the gates (i.e. the Caspian Gates/Dariel pass, although the Derbent pass would be the natural crossing from Albania northwards) because the Persians controlled them.

227 Czeglédy 1971, 146, suggests that Qardust remained in the region from c.530 to c.537, at which point his mission was relieved by that of the Armenian Macarius. See also Pigulevskaya 1969, 200–2 and n.223 above; she dates Qardust's mission to 537–544. She furthermore suggests (1969, 202) that the script used for the translation of the bible might have been Syro-Manichean or Sogdian, cf. also Land 1887, 191–3, on the language used.

228 Probus' mission took place in c.526 and is recounted by Proc. *Wars* i.12.6–9: see Greatrex 1998, 143–4 and n.15 on the date. Czeglédy 1971, 146–7, argues that Probus then continued eastwards, where he succeeded in recruiting Sabir Huns and others. Thus Queen Boa joined the Roman cause in 528 (Mal. 18.13), cf. Greatrex 1998, 143. Mal. here also refers to lavish gifts from the emperor, which ties in with the mention of presents here. Probus, the youngest nephew of the Emperor Anastasius, was a consistent anti-Chalcedonian, cf. Greatrex 1996a, 129.

229 Syriac '*mqr*', not Maku as HB 330 have.

of the nations saw the new thing, they were amazed and were very pleased with the men, and honoured them, each one among them, calling them to his own district and his own nation, begging them to be their teachers, and they are there until now.²³⁰ This is a sign of God's compassion, who in every place cares for everyone who is his own. Henceforth it is the time that is set under his own authority, so that a multitude of the nations will enter,²³¹ as the apostle said.²³²

p. For one week of years the Persian king, as those who know recount, has also separated himself from food that is strangulated and from blood, and from the meat of unclean animals and birds,²³³ since the time Tribonian, the *archiatros*, came down to him, who had been sent to him at that time, and from our serene emperor came Birwai, a perfect man, and after him Kashwai, and now Gabriel, a Christian from Nisibis. From that time he has been careful with his food, which is not taken according to its former custom, but is blessed and then he eats.²³⁴ He has access to him, as does Joseph, the *catholicos* of the Christians, and he is close to him because he is a physician, and sits before him on the first seat after the head of the Magians, and receives whatever he asks from him.²³⁵

230 Macarius is not otherwise attested. His mission will have lasted from the late 530s to the early 550s or possibly later, since PZ mentions that he was still there 'in his day', i.e. in 555, when this chapter was written. On the other hand, if the reference to Tribonian is taken at face value (n.235 below), this would imply a date of composition of 552, in which case a mission of 537–551 would fit very well. See Pigulevskaya 1969, 202, on the cultural developments brought by Macarius; Thompson 1946, 78–9 rightly underlines his efforts at settling the Huns by the construction of buildings and the introduction of crops.

231 Acts 1.7.

232 Romans 11.25, an allusion to the apocalypse. PZ sees in the extension of Christianity throughout the world a harbinger of the apocalypse; such views were common throughout the sixth century, as Magdalino 1993, 5–6, 9–11, well brings out, cf. Meier 2003a, 478–81.

233 Cf. Evagr. iv.28, Joh. Eph. HE vi.20, for reports of Khusro's conversion with Greatrex 2006, 40, cf. AK 383–4, Nöldeke 1879, 162. Schilling 2008, 37–41, cf. 231, deals with the story and its origins in greater detail.

234 According to Acts 10.9–16, no food was considered polluted for Christians, and so this reference is surprising. Nevertheless, certain Christians took a harder line, influenced by Jewish and other ascetic practices: see Grimm 1996, 15–18, 175–6. The position of *archiatros* in Persia corresponds to the Persian *drustabed*: see Richter-Benburg 1989, 334.

235 The chronological indicators here are puzzling. The doctor Tribonian (or Tribunus) visited Khusro at the king's request in 545 and earlier as a captive: see *PLRE* iii, Tribunus 2 and PZ ix n.95. Birwai was also a doctor, mentioned in *Chr. Seert*, PO 7 (1911), 149, 152, who advised Khusro, early in his reign, on the succession to the post of *catholicos*: see Tardieu 1989, 313 (improbably supposing him not to be a Christian), Labourt 1904, 1 60–2. Kashwai was the dedicatee of a treatise by the Nestorian disputant Paul of Nisibis which appeared in the

q. With compassion for the captives and holy men, on the advice [218] of the Christian physicians who are close to him, he has now built a hospital,²³⁶ something that is unusual, and has given the 100 mules and 50 camels that transport goods from the [storehouses] of the kingdom, and twelve doctors; and whatever is required is given, and in the court²³⁷ of the king ...²³⁸

wake of negotiations in Constantinople c.562: see Tardieu 1989, 316–7, Walker 2006, 174. He also was a generous patron of the school of Nisibis, Barhadbeshabba, *HE, PO* 9 (1911), 622 (tr. Becker 2008, 79). Nothing further is known of the doctor Gabriel, cf. Tardieu 1989, 314. Joseph was the (Nestorian) *catholicos* from 552 to 567; a doctor who had spent much time in Roman territory, he was appointed with Khusrō's support but quickly lost favour with his flock and was deposed after fifteen years with the king's assent. See *Chr. Seert, PO* 7 (1911), 176–81, Labourt 1904, 192–7, Tardieu 1989, 315..

236 No other source refers to this foundation of a hospital. The Nestorian physicians were undoubtedly an influential element at the Persian court in the late sixth and early seventh centuries: see Greatrex 2003, 80.

237 Syr. *palga*, meaning literally 'half.' This word also means 'school of thought.'

238 Here the narrative breaks off. At xii.7b above PZ implies that this geographical section came at the end of his work, so that we may not have lost a large portion of the book here.

APPENDIX 1

Works circulating in the early sixth century about the Council of Chalcedon (PZ vii.7, 8)

PZ twice refers to works supporting the Council of Chalcedon that were circulating in Constantinople during the reign of Anastasius.

(1) At vii.7b he refers to a compilation of quotations from the works of Diodore (of Tarsus) and Theodore (of Mopsuestia); it also contained excerpts from a work of Theodoret of Cyrhus concerning the Acts of Chalcedon (which had not been translated into Syriac). The patriarch Macedonius adorned it with gold and tried to hand it over to Anastasius, but the emperor refused to accept it.

(2) At vii.8c PZ recounts the fall of Macedonius in July 511. Among the accusations laid against him is that he and his associates, notably the deacon Pascasius, have compiled a large book containing excerpts from the heresies and then ornamented it in gold. Anastasius therefore insisted upon seeing this work before issuing his condemnation of the patriarch.

It is unclear whether PZ is referring to the same compilation in both cases. The fact that both were bound in gold and associated with Macedonius might favour an identification, but it seems odd that Anastasius should have to be told by the senator Romanus about the existence of the book in the second case if the patriarch had already tried to give it to the emperor in the first place. The confusion probably arises because Macedonius was considered to be the author of two distinct works. On the one hand, there was a collection of citations, some genuine, others spurious, from Saint Athanasius, known as 'On the faith'. This is mentioned by Severus, *Contra gramm. Or. III, pars posterior*, 137/99, tr. in Richard 1951, 734. Although Severus attributes this work to Macedonius, it seems likely that the compilation was made in the early fifth century, cf. Richard, *loc. cit.* On the other hand, the patriarch is said to have put together a compilation of extracts from Arius, Eunomius, Cyrus of Aegae and Nestorius (among others, but no mention of Theodore, Diodore or Theodoret is made). Severus is again our source for the existence of this work, *Contra gramm. Or. III, pars prior*, 294/206–7, cf. Richard 1951, 733–4, Lebon 1909, 126–7.

For a clearer picture it is necessary to consider other references to such compilations, otherwise known as florilegia, circulating at this time.

(a) Th. Lect. 481 (Theoph. 152.30–153.7) tells of a work by Dorotheus, an Alexandrian monk, in support of Chalcedon, which was passed on to the emperor through his sister-in-law Magna c.508; Severus, the later patriarch of Antioch, also refers to it and how it was presented to the emperor in a devious way in *L'Apologie du Philalèthe*, ed. and tr. Hespel 1971, 14–15/12–13 (= Hespel 1955, 26–9). He did not take the trouble to devote a treaty to refuting Dorotheus' work because it did not merit it. Unimpressed by the work and by its critical epigraph, Anastasius exiled Dorotheus to Oasis and condemned the work. See Charanis 1974, 19, Draguet 1924, 52–3, Hespel 1955, 33–4, Richard 1951, 734–5, Blaudeau 2006a, 473 n.46.

(b) Joh. V. Sev. 237–9 (text and tr. also in Hespel 1955, 20–2), cf. Zach. V. Sev. 105–6 (text and tr. also in Hespel 1955, 18), Athan. *Conflicts*, 678–9, describes how Chalcedonians in this period compiled a series of 244 extracts of Cyril of Alexandria in order to justify their position. Nearly the whole of this florilegium has survived, ed. Hespel 1955, cf. the review of Moeller 1956 and the remarks of Blaudeau 2006a, 474–6; Severus gives details of it at *Ep.* 2, 120/90, tr. Torrance 1988, 182, cf. Hespel 1955, 25–9, as also in *L'Apologie du Philalèthe*, 14–15/12–13 (= Hespel 1955, 27–9). It was built up in stages, and much was complete already by the late fifth century: see Richard 1951, 727–8. Blaudeau 2006a, 473–4, suggests that it was compiled in Alexandria and submitted by John Talaia to the pope in Rome in 483. Severus, *loc. cit.*, is careful to distinguish between (b) and (a) and states that (b) was handed to the patrician Apion by the *gazaphylakos* (treasurer) John during the patriarchate of Macedonius. According to John's biography of Severus, it was Macedonius who presented work (b) to Anastasius, who in turn asked the anti-Chalcedonian leader Severus for his opinion. In order to refute the work, Severus composed the *Philalèthès* ('lover of truth'), ed. and tr. Hespel 1952. See Grillmeier ii.2, 28–48/28–46, on both the document and Severus' work. Soon afterwards, Macedonius was removed from his post and exiled.

We should also note in passing Daley 1995, 41–54, the text and translation of a pagan oracle which formed part of a Chalcedonian florilegium put together c.511.

While Hespel 1955, 18–24, identifies the works mentioned by John and Zach. V. Sev., Lebon 1909, 126 (cf. 45 n.3) believes that John confused two distinct works ([a] and [b]). Whether (a) and (b) can be identified with (1) and (2) is doubtful. It is safest to suppose either that PZ is referring to

different works or that if he is referring to (a) or (b), then he is doing so in a very garbled fashion. Neither reference in PZ mentions Cyril, or indeed the *Philalêthês* (mentioned however at vii.10d); hence it is highly unlikely that (b) is being referred to by PZ. (2), on the other hand, might be the work of Dorotheus, i.e. (a), although there remains the problem of Anastasius asking to see the work, which was certainly not the case for Dorotheus' florilegium. The fact that the authors said to be cited by PZ are completely different from those mentioned by Severus also tends to imply that the two should not be identified.

APPENDIX 2

Table 1: Emperors and patriarchs (450–491)

(based on Blaudeau 2006a, 775. Anti-Chalcedonian patriarchs are italicised)

<i>Eastern emperor</i>	<i>Constantinople</i>	<i>Rome</i>	<i>Alexandria</i>	<i>Antioch</i>	<i>Jerusalem</i>
		Leo I (440–461)	<i>Dioscorus I</i> (444–454)	Domnus (441–449)	Juvenal (422–458)
	Anatolius (449–458)		Proterius (451–457)	Maximus (450–455)	<i>Theodosius</i> (451–453)
Marcian (450–7)				Basil	
Leo I (457–474)	Gennadius (458–471)		<i>Timothy</i> <i>Aelurus</i> (457–477, exiled, 460–475)	(455–457?) Acacius (458?–459?)	Anastasius (458–478)
		Hilary (461–468)	Timothy	Martyrius (459–471)	
Zeno (474–475)		Simplicius (468–483)	Salophaciolus (460–482)	<i>Peter the Fuller</i> (471)	
	Acacius (471–489)			Julian (471–475)	
Basiliscus (475–476)					
				<i>Peter the Fuller</i> (475–476)	
Zeno (476–491)				John	
			<i>Peter Mongus</i> (477–490)	Codonatus (476)	Martyrius (478–486)
		Felix III (II) (482–492)	John Talaia (482)	Stephen II (476)	
				Stephen III (?477–479)	
				Calendion (479–484)	
				<i>Peter the Fuller</i> (?485–488)	Sallust (486–494)
	Fravitta (489–490)		<i>Athanasius II</i> (490–496)	<i>Palladius</i> (488–498)	
	Euphemius (490–496)				

Table 2: Eastern emperors and patriarchs (491–565)

(based partly on Blaudeau 2006a, 775, partly on Grillmeier ii.3, 7, Winkelmann 1994, 142–3)

<i>Eastern emperor</i>	<i>Constantinople</i>	<i>Rome</i>	<i>Alexandria</i>	<i>Antioch</i>	<i>Jerusalem</i>
	Euphemius (490–496)		Athanasius II (490–496)	Palladius (488–498)	Sallust (486–494)
Anastasius (491–518)		Gelasius I (492–496)			Elias I (494–516)
	Macedonius II (496–511)	Anastasius II (496–498)	John I (496–505)		
		Symmachus (498–514)	John II Nikiotes (505–516)	Flavian II (498–512)	
	Timothy I (511–518)	Hormisdas (514–523)	Dioscorus II (516–517)	Severus (512–518, d. 538)	John III (516–524)
			Timothy IV (517–535)		
Justin I (518–527)	John II the Cappadocian (518–520)			Paul II (518–520)	
				Euphrasius (520–526)	Peter (524–552)
	Epiphanius (520–535)	John I (523–526)			
Justinian (527–565)		Felix IV (526–530)		Ephraem (526–545)	
		Boniface II (530–532)			
		John II (533–535)			
	Anthimus (535–536)	Agapitus (535–536)	Theodosius (535–536, d. 566)		
	Menas (536–552)	Silverius (536–537)	Gaianus (535)		
		Vigilius (537–555)	Paul the Taben- nesiote (538–540)		
			Zoilus (540–551)	Domnus III (545–559)	
	Eutychius (552–565)	Pelagius (556–561)	Apollinaris (551–570)		Macarius (552)
				Anastasius I (559–570)	Eustochius (552–563)
	John Scholasticus (565–577)	John III (561–574)			Macarius (563/4–574)

GLOSSARY

Some of these definitions are drawn from Whitby 2000a, 327–31, others from Blaudeau 2006a, 785–7, Gaddis and Price 2005, Lampe 1961, still others from Greatrex 1998; others again are original. We are grateful to the authors for permission to make use of their definitions, as to Francis Cairns for permission to reuse (with minor changes) those that appeared in Greatrex 1998; some of these were also subsequently adapted for use in Greatrex and Lieu 2002. We have inserted references to Jones 1964 (*LRE*) and to the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium (*ODB*), as on occasion to other relevant secondary works. Note also the useful glossary in Haarer 2006, 203–6.

AG or Annus Graecorum (Year of the Greeks): see Seleucid Era below.

anathema: a declaration of exclusion from the Church, analogous to excommunication, but somewhat stronger, and accompanied by the removal of the individual from the diptychs (see below). It was normally pronounced on heretical leaders, who could rejoin the Church, however, by disavowing their heretical views. Whitby 2000a, 327, Blaudeau 2006a, 785.

anti-Chalcedonians: opponents of the two-nature Christology approved at the Council of Chalcedon (see below) who judged that it divided Christ too decisively, rather in the manner of the Nestorian heresy. They believed rather that Christ had one *physis* and one *hypostasis*, which nevertheless combined human and divine elements. Steppa 2005, xix–xx, 154–5.

apocrisiarius: an official representative, usually of an absent bishop, e.g. for the pope at Constantinople, or for a provincial bishop at a church council. Blaudeau 2006a, 786.

apochistai: ‘separatists’, the term applied to a hard-line anti-Chalcedonian faction in Alexandria, opposed to the more conciliatory line of patriarch Peter Mongus. Because they had no leader they were also known as *akephaloi* (i.e. ‘headless’). Blaudeau 2006a, 785.

archiatros: the ‘chief doctor’ of a city, whose salary was paid by the city itself. There was also a post of *archiatros sacri palatii*, i.e. a court

physician, who enjoyed senatorial rank. *LRE* 736, 745, 387, Segal 1970, 138–9.

autocrator: the Greek term *autokratôr*, i.e. emperor, which we sometimes leave as ‘autocrator’ in the translation.

catholicus: the head of a national (independent) church, such as Armenia. *ODB* 1116.

Chalcedon: see Council of Chalcedon.

chartularius: an accountant who worked in the *scrinium* (bureau) of the praetorian prefect. *LRE*, 449–50, 589.

chiliarch: commander of a thousand men, a loose term. See PZ ix n.48.

chôrepiskopos: a bishop of a rural area, under the control of a bishop of the nearest city. Trombley and Watt 2000, 100 n.471.

city prefect: *praefectus urbi*, the official in charge of the imperial capital. *LRE* 692.

comes, pl. *comites*: a Count, a term given to various imperial officials. *LRE* 104–5, *ODB* 484–5.

comes domesticorum: the official in charge of the *domestici*, a corps of imperial bodyguards. *LRE* 636.

comes excubitorum: the official in charge of the excubitors (on whom see below).

comes foederatorum: the official in charge of the ‘federate’ (allied) forces. *LRE*, 665.

comes (sacrarum) largitionum: the Count of the Sacred Largess, a high-ranking official in charge of finances. *LRE* 427–38, *ODB* 486.

comes Orientis: the Count of the East, a civilian official. *LRE* 373–4.

consistorium: the imperial consistory, the emperor’s cabinet of high-ranking advisers. *LRE* 333–41.

Council of Chalcedon: the fourth ecumenical council of 451, held on the Asiatic coast just opposite Constantinople, at which a two-nature interpretation of Christ was approved.

cubicularius: a palace eunuch who served ‘the sacred bedchamber’ of the emperor. *LRE* 566–70, *ODB* 1154.

diptychs: a list of names on two tablets of those for whom prayers were offered during the liturgy in the course of the Eucharist; it was regularly updated and modified. Public recitation of these lists demonstrated who was accepted as orthodox, and thus removal or incorporation of a specific individual was regarded as indicative of the doctrinal affiliation of a particular see. Whitby 2000a, 328, Blaudeau 2006a, 786, Menze 2008a, 76–89.

domesticus: an aide of an imperial official, such as a general or governor. *LRE* 602–3.

dux, pl. *duces*: a Duke or military commander attached to a particular province or, subsequently, a particular fortress. *LRE* 609–10, *ODB* 659.

dyophysite: ‘two-nature’, referring to the christology that attributes two natures (divine and human) to Christ. This involves a continuing duality in Christ. Although it is the one Christ who possesses both human and divine attributes, the two sets are not commingled or confused: thus the Godhead cannot suffer, while the manhood remains corporeal and subject to change. The term was generally applied to the line taken at Chalcedon, which followed the more moderate pronouncements of Cyril of Alexandria, and two christologies where the two elements take on a greater independence of one another, from which the danger of Nestorianism arises. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 206.

economy, Gk. *oikonomia*: ‘dispensation’, a term used often by anti-Chalcedonians to underline the voluntary nature of Christ’s decision to become man. Lebon 1909, 194–5.

excommunication: the deprivation of the sacraments for an individual, determined either by a bishop or a council. In the case of a bishop, it would be preceded by his deposition from his see. Blaudeau 2006a, 786.

excubitor: a member of an élite corps of imperial guards. *LRE* 658–9, *ODB* 646.

foederati, sing. *foederatus*: technically soldiers serving in the Roman army by the terms of a treaty (*foedus*), but in fact scarcely different from members of the regular field army (*stratiôtai*) by the sixth century. *LRE* 663–4, *ODB* 794.

hypostasis, pl. *hypostaseis*, usually rendered into Syriac as *qnuma*: literally ‘substance’, a term whose meaning came to describe the individual reality of each member of the Trinity, whose overall unity was captured by the term *ousia*. Whitby 2000a, 329, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 207.

illustris, pl. *illustres*: the highest title available to senators. *LRE* 528–30, *ODB* 986–7.

indiction (year): from the mid-fifth century the indiction year, a system introduced by Diocletian for tax-gathering purposes, began on 1 September. It ran in a fifteen-year cycle. *ODB* 993, Feissel 2002b, 207.

lector: a reader of texts in church, a minor cleric. *ODB* 84.

libellus: literally a ‘little book’, hence a document, often an accusation or complaint. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 208.

magister militum: master of soldiery, high-ranking military official, generally rendered into Greek (then Syriac) as *stratêlatês*. *LRE* 608–10, *ODB* 1266–7.

magister officiorum, the master of offices, the head of the central civil administration of the empire. *LRE* 368–9, *ODB* 1267.

magistrianus: an official on the staff of the *magister officiorum*.

martyrium or *martyrion*: a shrine to a martyr, i.e. a holy figure who had died for their Christian faith.

marzban: the Persian title of a governor of a province. Christensen 1944, 136–7.

miaphysite: a term more commonly used now for anti-Chalcedonians, referring to their emphasis on the one nature of Christ. See anti-Chalcedonians (above).

modius, pl. *modii*: a unit of measurement of grain or land. *ODB* 1388.

monophysite: a term formerly much used for anti-Chalcedonians (see above), which misleadingly implies, however, that they believed that Christ had only one (divine) nature. This was rather the view of a small minority of anti-Chalcedonians, those who claimed to follow Eutyches and insisted that Christ's human nature was superceded by his divine one.

nature: see *physis*.

Nestorianism: the heresy that divided Christ into two distinct natures, divine and human, associated with each other in harmony of will and communication of grace but not united ontologically. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 209.

notarius: a scribe or notary, i.e. secretaries in the imperial bureaucracy. *LRE* 572–5, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 209–10.

oikonomos: a steward in the church, in charge of property and revenues. Trombley and Watt 2000, 100 n.469.

ousia (Syr. *usiya*, from the Gk): the 'essence' (of God). Each member of the Trinity was regarded as sharing in the one (and only) divine *ousia*. See also *hypostasis*, *physis*. There was some confusion over the terms *physis* and *hypostasis* in the Christological controversies of the fifth and subsequent centuries, which heightened the disagreements between the various parties.

patrician, a high-ranking dignity. *LRE* 528, 534, *ODB* 1600.

person: see *prosôpon* below.

phylarch: a commander of auxiliaries (often Arab) allied to the empire. *LRE* 611, *ODB* 1672.

physis, pl. *physeis*, Syr. *kyana*, literally 'nature', generally of Christ.

- Chalcedonians held that Christ united two distinct natures, human and divine, while opponents of the council considered that he possessed just one nature, a complex union of both elements. Syriac typically renders Gk. *homoousios*, ‘consubstantial’ with *bar kyana*.
- praepositus (sacri cubiculi)*: the grand chamberlain of the palace. *LRE* 567–70, *ODB* 1709.
- praetorian prefect: an important regional civil functionary, in particular the leading civilian functionary in the imperial bureaucracy at Constantinople. *LRE* 370–2, *ODB* 1710–11.
- primicerius*: a term designating the senior member of any group of functionaries. *ODB* 1719–20.
- prosôpon* (Syr. *paršopa*, from the Gk): a loose term referring to Christ, held to be ‘one person’. Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 210.
- protector*: a senior soldier. *LRE* 636–40, *ODB* 1743.
- quaestor (sacri palatii)*: a high-ranking imperial official concerned with legal matters. *LRE* 387, *ODB* 1765–6.
- scholae (palatinae)*, sing. *schola*: the corps of guards of the imperial palace. *LRE* 647–8, *ODB* 1851–2.
- scholasticus*: a title frequently applied to lawyers. *ODB* 1852.
- Seleucid Era: a dating system that prevailed through much of the Roman East, which took as its base the reconquest of Babylon in August 312 by Seleucus I, one of the successors of Alexander the Great, and was generally held as starting on 1 October 312 B.C. It is often referred to as *Annus Graecorum* (year of the Greeks) or AG. Trombley and Watt 2000, lii.
- silentarius*: a ‘silentiary’, a member of a corps of thirty staff in the imperial palace under the control of three decurions. *LRE* 571–2.
- silentium*: a session of the imperial *consistorium* (see above). *LRE* 333.
- solidus*, pl. *solidi*: a gold coin known in Greek as the *nomisma*.
- spâhbadh*: a Persian general. Christensen 1944, 131.
- stade: a classical unit of measurement of distance. *ODB* 1373.
- stratêgos*: the traditional Greek word for a general. *ODB* 1964.
- stratêlatês*: another Greek term for a general, often used of a *magister militum*.
- syncellus*: ‘cell-mate’, i.e. a close adviser of a bishop or patriarch who lived with him. *ODB* 1993–4.
- synod: synonym, derived from the Greek, for council.
- synodos endêmousa*, generally translated ‘home synod’: a standing council of bishops in Constantinople, convened to discuss ecclesiastical business

that arose periodically. Blaudeau 2006a, 410–16, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 207.

Theopaschism: the doctrine that, because of the unity of divinity and humanity in the incarnate Christ, God could be said to have suffered. Provided that theopaschite language was directly applied to Christ, as in the anti-Chalcedonian interpretation of Peter the Fuller's addition to the Trisagion, or to 'one of the Trinity', as Justinian proposed, the heresy of attributing suffering to God himself could be avoided. Whitby 2000a, 330–1, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 211.


Tome: usually a reference to the Tome of (Pope) Leo, his letter to patriarch Flavian of Constantinople of June 449, in which he laid out a two-nature doctrine of Christ in opposition to the theories of Eutyches. It was endorsed by the Council of Chalcedon. Whitby 2000a, 331, Gaddis and Price 2005, iii, 212.

Trisagion: the refrain 'Holy God, Holy and strong, Holy and immortal, have mercy on us' chanted during the liturgy. Whereas at Antioch it was generally regarded as referring to Christ, and thus the addition of 'who was crucified for us' was uncontroversial, it caused great commotion in Constantinople, where the refrain was interpreted as designating the entire Trinity. See also Theopaschism. Whitby 2000a, 331.


typos or 'type': a foreshadowing in the Old Testament of events later of significance in the history of the Christian church. *ODCC* 1649.

vir illustris, a man possessing the highest dignity of the empire. *LRE* 528–30.


MAPS




Map 1 Constantinople and its environs




Map 2 Osroene and Mesopotamia




Map 3 The eastern frontier




Map 4 The frontier south of the Tur Abdin



Map 5 The Near East



Map 6 Monasteries of the East (cf. PZ viii.5)



Map 7. Peoples of the Caucasus (Hewsen 2001, map 68)



Map 8 Peoples of the Caucasus (Land 1887)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS FOR THE MAPS

Map 1 is adapted from Michael and Mary Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale, 284–628 AD* (Liverpool, 1989), map 1, and P. Hatlie, *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca.350–850* (Cambridge, 2007), map 3, with some additions, with kind permission of the authors.

Map 2 is adapted from F.R. Trombley and J.W. Watt, *The Chronicle of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite* (Liverpool, 2000) map II, with a few modifications, with kind permission of the authors.

Map 3 is adapted from M. Whitby, *The Emperor Maurice and his historian* (Oxford, 1988) map 11, with a few modifications, with kind permission of the author.

Map 4 is adapted from G. Greatrex, *Rome and Persia at War, 502–532* (Leeds, 1998), map 9, with a few modifications.

Map 5 is adapted from W. Witakowski, *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle, known also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin. Part III* (Liverpool, 1996), with a few additions, with kind permission of the author.

Map 6 is derived from a range of sources and was kindly prepared by Jing Feng, a doctoral student in Geography at the University of Ottawa.

Map 7 is a reproduction of Hewsen 2001, map 68 (p.89), with the kind permission of the author.

Map 8 is a reproduction of J.P.N. Land, 'Aardrijkskundige fragmenten uit de syrische literatuur der zesde en zevende eeuw', *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, III.3 (1887), where it follows his article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Acts Chalc. The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, tr. and comm. R. Price and M. Gaddis. Liverpool 2005. References are also given to *ACO*.
- Acts Eph. II. Akten der ephesinischen Synode vom Jahre 449*, ed. and Ger. tr. J. Flemming, *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl., n.s. 15, 1917: 1–159, tr. S.G.F. Perry, *The Second Synod of Ephesus*. Dartford 1881; and parts in Doran 2006 (below).
- Acts of Paul (and Thecla)*, ed. R.A. Lipsius, ‘Acta Pauli et Theclae’ in *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, Pars Prior*, ed. R.A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet. Leipzig 1891, repr. Hildesheim 1959: 235–272; tr. W. Rordorf, P. Cherix, R. Kasser, ‘Actes de Paul’ in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I*, ed. F. Bovon and P. Geoltrain. Paris 1997: 1117–77.
- Aeneas of Gaza, *Theophrastus*, ed. M.E. Colonna, *Enea di Gaza. Teofrasto*. Naples 1958.
- Agathias, *Historiae*, ed. R. Keydell. Berlin 1967; tr. J.D. Frendo. Berlin 1975.
- Alexander Romance*, ed. and tr. E.A.W. Budge, *History of Alexander the Great*, 2 vols. Cambridge 1889.
- Ambrose, *De fide [ad Gratianum Augustum]*, ed. O. Faller. CSEL 78.8. Vienna 1962.
- Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, ed. W. Seyfarth. Leipzig 1978; also ed., tr. and comm. E. Galletier, J. Fontaine, G. Sabbah, M.-A. Marié and L. Angliviel de la Baumelle, 6 vols. Paris 1978–2002; tr. J.C. Rolfe, 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1935–9.
- Anecd. Cramer*, ‘Εκκλογαὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἐκκλησιαστικῆς Ἱστορίας, ed. J. Cramer in *Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae regiae parisiensis*, vol.2. Oxford 1839: 87–114.
- Anon. Val. Anonymus Valesiana in J. Moreau, ed., *Excerpta Valesiana*. Leipzig 1968; tr. J.C. Rolfe in vol.3 of Ammianus Marcellinus (see above). Ger. tr. by König 1997: see under secondary sources.
- Anth. Gr. Anthologia Graeca*, ed. H. Beckby, 4. vols. Munich 1957–8. Eng. tr. W.R. Paton, 5 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1916–18.
- Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, ed. and tr. W. Wright, 2 vols. London 1871.
- Aristeas, *Letter to Philocrates*, ed. and tr. M. Hadas. New York 1951.
- Athanasiana Syriaca*, ed. and tr. R.W. Thomson, parts I-II, CSCO Scr. Syr. 114–5,

- 118–9. Louvain 1965; part III, ed. and tr. R.W. Thomson, CSCO Scr. Syr. 142–3. Louvain 1972.
- [Athanasius] *Quod unus sit Christus (Discourse of Saint Athanasius on the faith and that Christ is one)* in R.W. Thomson, ed. and tr., *Athanasiana Syriaca*, vol.3, CSCO Scr. Syr. 142–3. Louvain 1972: 139–46/97–102.
- Athanasius, *The Conflict of Severus, patriarch of Antioch*, ed. and tr. E.J. Goodspeed, PO 4 (1907); also ed. and tr. Y.N. Youssef, *The Arabic Life of Severus*, PO 49 (2004).
- Barhadbeshabba, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, part 2, ed. and tr. F. Nau, PO 9 (1911), 493–611; Eng. tr. A. Becker, *Sources for the History of the School of Nisibis*, TTH. Liverpool 2008.
- Barhebraeus, *Chr. Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Syriacum*, ed. P. Bedjan. Paris 1890, tr. E.A.W. Budge, *The Chronography of Gregory Abu'l Faraj (Bar Hebraeus)*, 2 vols. London 1932.
- Barhebraeus, *CE. Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon Ecclesiasticum*, 3 vols., ed. and tr. J.B. Abbeloos and T.J. Lamy. Louvain 1872–7. References are to vol.1 unless otherwise noted.
- Basil (of Caesarea), *Letters*, ed. and Fr. tr. Y. Courtonne, 3 vols. Paris 1957–66. Eng. tr. A.C. Way, 2 vols. New York 1951–5.
- Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, ed. R. Mynors. Oxford 1961. Tr. J.W. Halporn, with an introduction by M. Vessey, *Institutions of Divine and Secular Learning; On the Soul*, TTH. Liverpool 2004.
- Cassiodorus, *Variae*, ed. T. Mommsen, *MGH AA* xii: 1–392. Partial tr. S.J.B. Barnish, *The Variae of Cassiodorus*, TTH. Liverpool 1992.
- Catena in epistolas catholicas*, ed. J.A. Cramer. Oxford 1840.
- Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum*, *CSHB*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols. Bonn 1838–9.
- Chronica Minora*, ed. and tr. I. Guidi, J.-B. Chabot, E.W. Brooks, 3 vols., CSCO Scr. Syr. 1–6. Louvain 1903–7.
- Chr. 724. Chronicon Miscellaneum ad A.D. 724 pertinens*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 3–4, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot. Paris, 1903; partial translation in Palmer 1993: 14–23.
- Chr. 819. Chronicon anonymum ad a.d. 819*, ed. J.-B. Chabot along with *Chr. 1234*, vol.1. Partial tr. in Palmer 1993: 75–82.
- Chr. 846. Chronicon ad A.D. 846 pertinens*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 3–4, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot. Louvain 1904. Partial tr. in Palmer 1993: 75–82.
- Chr. 1234. Chronicon anonymum ad a.c. 1234 pertinens*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 55–6, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot. Louvain 1937. Partial translation in Palmer 1993: 111–221.
- Chr. Ede. Chronicon Edessenicum*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 1–2, ed. I. Guidi. Paris 1903; also in *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik*, ed. and tr. L. Hallier. Leipzig 1892.
- Chr. Pasch. Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, *CSHB*. Bonn 1832. Partial tr. by M. and M. Whitby, *Chronicon Paschale 284–628 AD*, TTH. Liverpool 1989.
- Chr. Seert. Chronicle of Seert (= Histoire nestorienne inédite)*, ed. A. Scher, tr. l'abbé Pierre, PO 4 (1908), 5 (1910), 7 (1911) and 13 (1919).

- C.J. *Codex Justinianus*, ed. P. Krueger, eleventh edition. Berlin 1954.
- C.Th. *Codex Theodosianus*, ed. T. Mommsen, third edition. Berlin 1962. Tr. C. Pharr. Princeton 1952.
- Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1431, eine antichalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaiser Zenos*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Abh. der bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 22–6. Munich 1927.
- Coll. Avell. Collectio Avellana*, ed. O. Guenther, CSEL 35. Vienna 1895.
- Cosmas Indic. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographie chrétienne*, ed. W. Wolska-Conus, 3 vols., SC 141, 159, 197. Paris 1968–73.
- Curiosum*, see *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae* below.
- Cyr. *Coll. A Collection of unpublished letters of Cyril of Alexandria*, ed. and tr. R.Y. Ebied and L.R. Wickham, CSCO Scr. Syr. 157–8. Louvain 1975.
- Cyr. *De Rect. Fid. Ad Theod. Imp.* Cyril of Alexandria, *De Recta fide ad Theodosium imperatorem*, ed. E. Schwartz in ACO i.1 (1927), 42–72; tr. O. Bardenheuer with notes by M. Weischer, *Cyrrill von Alexandrien. Über den rechten Glauben*. Munich 1984: 11–66.
- Cyr. *Ep. 1 ad Succensum*, ed. and tr. L. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria. Select Letters*. Oxford 1983, 70–83; also tr. J. McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy*. Leiden 1994: 352–8.
- Cyr. *Ep. 2 ad Succensum*, ed. and tr. L. Wickham, *Cyril of Alexandria. Select Letters*. Oxford 1983, 84–93; also tr. J. McGuckin, *St Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy*. Leiden 1994: 359–63.
- Cyr. Scyth. Cyril of Scythopolis, ed. E. Schwartz, *Kyrrillos von Skythopolis*, TU 49.2. Leipzig 1939. Fr. tr. and comm. A.J. Festugière, *Les moines d'Orient: Les moines de Palestine*, III.1–3. Paris 1962–3; tr. R. M. Price with J. Binns, *The Lives of the Monks of Palestine*. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1991.
- Damascius, ed. and tr. P. Athanassiadi, *Damascius. The philosophical history*. Athens 1999.
- De Cer.* Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis*, ed. J.J. Reiske, CSHB. Bonn 1829.
- De ob. Theod., De obitu Theodosii, Narratio de obitu Theodosii et Romani monachi*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks in *Vitae Virorum apud Monophysitas Celeberrimorum*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 7–8. Louvain 1907: 21–7/15–19. The first number referred to is the section number in the new ed. and tr. of Horn and Phenix (see *V. Petr. Iber.* below), the second is the pagination in Brooks' Syriac edition.
- De pol. sci. dial.* Anon., *Menae patricii cum Thoma referendario de politica scientia dialogus*, ed. M. Mazzuchi, 2nd ed. Milan 2002. Tr. P.N. Bell, *Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian*, TTH. Liverpool 2009: 123–88.
- De SS Cyriaco, Largo, Smaragdo et sociis martyribus*, in ASS August, vol.2 (8 August). Venice 1751: 327–40.
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *De Divinis Nominibus*, ed. B.R. Suchla. Berlin 1990.
- Ps. Dion. (PD) i. *Chronicon pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum*, vol.1, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot, CSCO Scr. Syr. 43, 66. Louvain 1927–49.

- Ps. Dion. (PD) ii. *Chronicon pseudo-dionysianum vulgo dictum*, vol.2, ed. J.-B. Chabot, CSCO Scr. Syr. 53. Paris 1933. Tr. R. Hespel, CSCO Scr. Syr. 213. Louvain 1989. Partial tr. in W. Witakowski, *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, Chronicle, known also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin. Part III*. Liverpool 1996.
- Documenta ad origines Monophysitarum illustrandas*, ed. and tr. J.B. Chabot. CSCO Scr. Syr. 17, 52. Louvain 1907–33.
- Eli of Qartamin, *Memra sur S. Mar Philoxène de Mabbog*, ed. and tr. A. de Halleux, CSCO Scr. Syr. 100–101. Louvain 1963.
- Elias Nis. Elias of Nisibis, *Eliae Metropolitae Nisibeni Opus Chronologicum*, pars prior, CSCO Scr. Syr. 21–2, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks. Rome-Paris-Leipzig 1910.
- Euseb. *Chronographia*. Eusebius, *Die Chronik*, tr. J. Karst, GCS. Leipzig 1911.
- Euseb. *HE* Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. E. Schwartz, GCS. Berlin 1903–9; tr. G.A. Williamson, *Eusebius. The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine*. London 1965.
- Euseb. VC. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelmann, *Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, GCS, 2nd ed. Berlin 1991; tr. Averil Cameron and S.G. Hall, *Eusebius, Life of Constantine*. Oxford 1999.
- Eust. Epiph. Eustathius of Epiphania, fragments, ed. C. Müller in *FHG* iv: 138–42.
- Eutychn. *Ann. Eutychnius, Annales*, tr. Pocock in *PG* 111.
- Evagr. *HE*. Evagrius, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, tr. M. Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. Liverpool 2000, Ital. tr. F. Carcione, *Evagrio. Storia Ecclesiastica*. Rome 1998; Ger. tr. with text of Bidez and Parmentier, A. Hübner, 2 vols. Turnhout 2007.
- Facundus, *Defensio Trium Capitulorum* in J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, eds, *Facundi Episcopi Ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia*, CCSL 90A. Turnhout 1974: 3–398.
- Gregory Nazianzenus, *Discours 27–31*, ed. and Fr. tr. P. Gallay, SC 250. Paris 1978.
- Gregory Nazianzenus, *Discours 38–41*, ed. C. Moreschini, Fr. tr. P. Gallay, SC 358. Paris 1990.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio catechetica*, ed. E. Mühlenberg, *Gregori Nysseni Oratio catechetica* in *Gregori Nysseni opera*, vol.3.4. Leiden 1996.
- Greg. Tur. *Passio*. Gregory of Tours, *Passio septem dormientium* in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptorum rerum Merovingiacarum*, VII.2, ed. B. Krusch. Hanover-Leipzig 1920: 757–69.
- Hdt. Herodotus, *Histories*, ed. and tr. A.D. Godley. Cambridge, MA, 1920–5.
- Hist. Diosc.* ‘Histoire de Dioscore, patriarche d’Alexandrie, écrite par son disciple Théopiste’, ed. and tr. F. Nau, *JA* 1 (1903): 5–108, 241–310.
- Hist. Patr. Alex.* ‘History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria, II. Peter I to Benjamin I (661)’, ed. and tr. B. Evetts, *PO* 1 (1907): 383–518.
- Hydat. Hydatius, *Chronicle*, ed. R.W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*. Oxford 1993.
- Jac. Ede. *Chr. Chronicon Iacobi Edesseni*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 3–4, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks. Paris 1903.

- Jac. Ede. *Hex.* Jacob of Edessa, *Hexaemeron*, ed. J.B. Chabot, tr. A.A. Vaschalde, CSCO Scr. Syr. 44, 48. Louvain 1928–32.
- Jac. Serug. *Iacobi Sarugensis epistulae quotquot supersunt*, ed. G. Olinder, CSCO Scr. Syr. 57. Louvain 1952; Fr. tr. M. Albert, *Les Lettres de Jacques de Saroug*. Kaslik 2004.
- Jac. Serug. *Hom. Bap. Con. L'Omelia di Giacomo di Sarug sul Battesimo di Costantino Imperatore*, Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Anno 279, ed. A.L. Frothingham. Rome 1881–2.
- Jerome. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*, ed. R. Helm, GCS. Berlin 1956.
- Joh. Ant. John of Antioch, fragments, ed. and tr. S. Mariev, *Iohannis Antiocheni Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, CFHB. Berlin-New York 2008.
- Joh. Diakr. Johannes Diakrinomenos, *Fragmenta*, in G. Hansen, ed., *Theodoros Anagnostes. Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed. Berlin 1995: 152–7.
- Joh. Eph. *HE.* John of Ephesus, *Historiae Ecclesiasticae Pars Tertia*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 54–5, ed. and Lat. tr. E.W. Brooks. Louvain 1952. Translated also by R. Payne Smith, *The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus*. Oxford 1860.
- Joh. Eph., *Lives.* John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, *PO* 17 (1923), 18 (1924) and 19 (1925).
- Joh. Lyd. *De Mag.* John Lydus, *De Magistratibus Populi Romani*, ed. and Fr. tr. J. Schamp, 2 vols. Paris 2006; also tr. A. Bandy, *On Powers, or The Magistracies of the Roman State*. Philadelphia 1982.
- Joh. Lyd. *De ost.* John Lydus, *Liber De Ostentis*, ed. C. Wachsmuth. Leipzig 1868.
- John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, ed. and Fr. tr. M.-J. Rouët de Journel, SC 12. Paris 1946; also tr. J. Wortley, *The Spiritual Meadow*, Kalamazoo, MI, 1992.
- Joh. Nik. *Chronicle of John, bishop of Nikiu*, tr. R.H. Charles. London 1916.
- Joh. Ruf. *Pleroph.* John Rufus, *Plérophories*, ed. and tr. F. Nau, *PO* 8 (1911).
- Joh. Vit. Sev. John of Bet Aphthonia, *Vita Severi*, ed. and tr. M.-A. Kugener, *PO* 2 (1904): 207–64.
- Jord. *Get.* Jordanes, *Getica*, ed. T. Mommsen, *MGH AA*, vol.5. Berlin 1882. Tr. C.C. Mierow, *The Gothic History of Jordanes*. Princeton 1915. Fr. tr. O. Devillers. Paris 1995.
- Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, ed. and tr. H. Thackeray et al., 6 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1931–65.
- Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, ed. and tr. H. Thackeray, 2 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1927–8.
- Ps.-Josh. (Pseudo-)Joshua the Stylite in J.B. Chabot, *Incerti Auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum*, vol.1, CSCO Scr. Syr. 43: 235–316. Louvain 1927; also ed. and tr. W. Wright, *The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite*. Cambridge 1882 and tr. J. Watt and F. Trombley, TTH. Liverpool 2000.
- Koriwn, *V. Maštoc'*, ed. and tr. G. Winkler, *Koriwns Biographie des Mesrop Maštoc'*. Rome 1994.
- Łazar. *Patmut' iwn Hayots'*, ed. G. T'r-Mkrтч'ean and S. Malkhasean. Tiflis 1904,

- repr. Delmar, NY, 1985; tr. R.W. Thomson, *The History of Lazar P'arpec'i*. Atlanta, Georgia, 1991.
- Leo, *ep.* [Pope] Leo, *Letters*, ed. Ballerini, *PL* 54, also in *ACO* i-iv, ed. E. Schwartz, and in O. Guenther, *Epistolae Imperatorum Pontificorum*, CSEL. Vienna 1895; *S. Leonis Magni Epistulae*, 4 vols., ed. C. Silva-Tarouca. Rome 1932–5. English translation by E. Hunt, *St. Leo the Great. Letters*. New York 1957.
- Leontius, *De Sectis*. Leontius Byzantinus (seu Jerosolymitanus), *De Sectis*, *PG* 86.1194–1267. See also *ODB* 1213 for other potential attributions of the work.
- Leontius, *Test.* Leontius, *Testimonies of the Saints* in *PG* 86.1804–1901, ed. and tr. P.T.R. Gray, *Leontius of Jerusalem. Against the Monophysites: Testimonies of the Saints and Aporiae*. Oxford 2006: 646–161.
- Leontius, *Adv. fraudem Apoll.* Leontius, *Adversus fraudem Apollinistarum*, *PG* 86.1948–76.
- Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae*, ed. A. Nordh. Lund 1949.
- Lib. Brev. Liberatus, Breviarium*, in *ACO* ii.5: 98–141.
- Lib. Pont. Le Liber Pontificalis*, ed. and tr. L. Duchesne, 3 vols. Paris 1955–7. Tr. R. Davis, *The Book of Pontiffs*, 2nd ed., TTH. Liverpool 2000.
- Malalas, *Chronographia*, ed. J. Thurn, CFHB. Berlin 2000, also ed. L. Dindorf, CSHB. Bonn 1831; tr. E. and M. Jeffreys and R. Scott. Melbourne 1986.
- Mansi, J.D. *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio*, 53 vols. Paris 1901–27.
- Marc. *com.* *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, ed. Th. Mommsen, tr. B. Croke. Sydney 1995; Mommsen's original text in *MGH AA* xi: 60–104.
- Martyrium Arethae*, ed. M. Detoraki, tr. J. Beaucamp, *Le martyre de saint Aréthas*. Paris 2007.
- Marcianus, *Periplus Maris Exteri*, ed. C. Müller in *Geographici Graeci Minores*, vol.1. Paris 1855: 514–62.
- Melkite Chronicle*. See de Halleux 1978 below.
- Men. Prot. *The History of Menander the Guardsman*, ed. and tr. R.C. Blockley. Leeds 1985.
- Methodius, *De Resurrectione*, ed. G.N. Bonwetsch, *Methodius*, GCS. Leipzig 1917.
- Michael the Syrian, ed. and tr. J.-B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche (1166–1199)*, 4 vols. Paris 1899–1924. The references to a, b and c refer to columns in the Syriac: from left to right these are arranged in the order c, a, b. In Chabot's French translation, a is usually translated first, followed by two columns: c (ecclesiastical affairs) is placed on the right, b (secular affairs) on the left.
- Mos. Khor. Moses Khorenats'i. *Patmut'iwn Hayots'*, ed. M. Abelean and S. Yartut'iwnan. Tiflis 1913, repr. Delmar, NY, 1981; tr. R.W. Thomson, *Moses Khorenats'i, History of the Armenians*. Cambridge, Mass., 1978, 2nd ed. Ann Arbor, 2006. Fr. tr. A. and J.-P. Mahé. Paris 1993.
- Niceph. *Chr. synt.* Nicephorus, *Chronographeion syntomon*, ed. C. de Boor in *Nicephori opuscula historica*. Leipzig 1880: 81–135.

- Niceph. *Short History. Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople. Short History*, ed. and tr. C. Mango, CFHB. Washington, D.C., 1990.
- Nic. Call. Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus, *Ecclesiasticae Historiae*, ed. J.-P. Migne, PG 145–7.
- Notitia Dignitatum*, ed. O. Seeck. Berlin 1876, repr. Frankfurt 1962.
- Notitia Galliarum*, ed. T. Mommsen, MGH AA ix: 584–612.
- Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae* in *Notitia Dignitatum*, ed. Seeck: 227–43.
- Notitia Urbis Romae*, see *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae* above.
- NovJ. Justinian, *Novellae* in *Corpus Juris Civilis* vol.3, edd. R. Schoell and W. Kroll, sixth edition. Berlin 1954.
- Olympiodorus, fragments in *FCH*, ii: 152–208.
- Pan. Mac. A *Panegyric on Macarius, bishop of Tkôw attributed to Dioscorus of Alexandria*, ed. and tr. D.W. Johnson, CSCO 415–16. Louvain 1980.
- Pel. Def. Pelagius, *In Defensione Trium Capitulorum*, ed. R. Devreesse. Vatican 1932.
- Peshitta, *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, ed. on behalf of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament by the Peshitta Institute, Leiden 1977–.
- Philostorgius, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez, rev. G. Winkelmann. Berlin 1981. Tr. P. Amidon, *Philostorgius. Church History*. Leiden 2007.
- Philoxenus, *Letter to Maron, a lector of Anazarbos*, ed. J. Lebon, ‘Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabbog’, *Muséon* 43 (1930): 17–84.
- Philoxenus, *Letter to the monks of Palestine*, ed. and tr. A. de Halleux, ‘Nouveaux textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabbog I’, *Muséon* 75 (1962): 33–45.
- Philoxenus, *Letter to the monks of Senun*, ed. and tr. A. de Halleux, *Lettre aux moines de Senoun*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 98–9. Louvain 1963.
- Philoxenus, *Letter to Simeon of Teleda*, ed. J. Lebon, ‘Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabbog’, *Muséon* 43 (1930): 172–93.
- Photius, *Bibliotheca*, ed. and tr. R. Henry, 9 vols. Paris 1959–91. Partial tr. N. Wilson, *Photius. The Bibliotheca*. London 1994.
- Pliny, *HN*. Pline, *Histoire naturelle, livre III*, ed. and tr. H. Zehnecker. Paris 1998. Eng. Tr. H. Rackham, *Pliny. Natural History*, vol.2. Cambridge, MA, 1942.
- Polemius Silvius, *Nomina Provinciarum* (in *Laterculus Polemii Silvii*), ed. T. Mommsen, MGH AA ix: 535–42.
- Polemius Silvius, *Quae sint Romae* (in *Laterculus Polemii Silvii*), ed. T. Mommsen, MGH AA ix: 545–6; also edd. R. Valentini and G. Zucchetti. Rome 1940: 308–10.
- Priscus. Priscus of Panium, in *FCH*, ii: 222–376.
- Proc. Aed. Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth. Leipzig 1964; ed. and tr. H. B. Dewing. Cambridge, Mass., 1940.
- Proc. Anecd. Procopius, *Anecdota*, ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth. Leipzig, 1963; ed. and tr. H. B. Dewing. Cambridge, Mass., 1935.
- Proc. Wars. Procopius, *Bella*, ed. J. Haury, rev. G. Wirth, 2 vols. Leipzig 1963; ed. and tr. H. B. Dewing, 5 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1914–28.
- Pseudo-Dionysius (PD): see under Dionysius above.

- Die Pseudoklementinen*, vol.1, ed. B. Rehm, rev. G. Strecker, GCS. Berlin 1992; tr. M.-A. Calvet, D. Côté, P. Geoltrain, A. Le Boulluec, B. Pouderon, A. Schneider, 'Roman pseudo-clémentin: Homélie' in *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens II*, ed. P. Geoltrain and J.-D. Kaestli. Paris 2005: 1235–1589.
- Die Pseudoklementinen*, vol.2, *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*, 2nd ed., ed. B. Rehm and F. Paschke, GCS. Berlin 1994; Fr. tr. A. Schneider and L. Cirillo, *Les Reconnaissances du pseudo Clément. Roman chrétien des premiers siècles*. Turnhout 1999. Cf. *Die syrischen Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltex*, TU 48.3. Leipzig 1937.
- Ptol. Ptolemy, *Geographia*, *Klaudios Ptolemaios, Handbuch der Geographie*, ed. and Ger. tr. A. Stückelberger and G. Grasshoff, 2 vols. Basel 2006. Also ed. C. Müller, *Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia*, 2 vols. Paris 1883–1901 (books I–V); ed. C.F.A. Nobbe. Leipzig 1843–5 (all books); Eng. tr. and ed. H. Humbach and S. Ziegler, *Ptolemy. Geography, Book 6*. Wiesbaden 1998. Tr. E.L. Stevenson. New York 1932. The first reference is always to the latest edition; in brackets, where there is a difference, we have retained references to chapters and sections in Müller up to the end of book v, Humbach and Ziegler for vi, and thenceforth Nobbe.
- Publizistische Sammlungen zum acacianischen Schisma*, ed. E. Schwartz, *Abh. der bayer. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Klasse, N.F. 10. Munich 1934.
- Quodvultdeus, *De tempore barbarico ii* in *Opera Quodvultdeo Carthaginiensi episcopo tributa*, ed. R. Braun, CCSL 60. Turnhout 1976: 473–86.
- Rabbula Corpus*, ed. and tr. C. Horn and R. Phenix. Atlanta forthcoming, 2011.
- Sev. *Apologie du Philalèthe* in *La polémique antijulianiste*, vol.3, ed. and tr. R. Hespel. CSCO Scr. Syr. 135–6. Louvain 1971.
- Sev. *Coll.* 'A Collection of letters of Severus of Antioch', ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, *PO* 12 (1915), *PO* 14 (1919).
- Sev. *Contra Gramm. Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium grammaticum*, ed. and tr. J. Lebon, CSCO Scr. Syr. 45–6, 50–1, 58–9. Louvain 1929–38.
- Sev. *Ep.* Second part of *Severi Antiocheni Orationes ad Nephaliū; eiusdem ac Sergii Grammaticum epistulae mutuae*, ed. and Lat. tr. J. Lebon, CSCO Scr. Syr. 64–5. Louvain 1949. English tr. in Torrance 1988, 143–235.
- Sev. *Hom. Cath.* Severus, *Homélie cathédrales*, ed. and Fr. tr. M. Brière, *PO* 26 (1946). A full list of the location of all the homilies may be found in Roux 2003, 427 n.2 or Gribomont 1975–6, 127 n.4.
- Sev. *Lett.* Severus, *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks. Oxford 1903.
- Sev. *Phil.* Severus, *Philalèthe*, ed. and Fr. tr. R. Hespel, CSCO Scr. Syr. 68–9. Louvain 1952.
- Sev. *Pol.* Severus, *La polémique antijulianiste*, 3 vols., ed. and Fr. tr. R. Hespel, CSCO Scr. Syr. 104–5, 124–7, 136–7. Louvain 1968–71.
- Socr. *HE.* Socrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, GCS. Berlin 1995. Fr. tr. P. Périchon and P. Maraval, comm. P. Maraval, SC 477, 493, 505–6, 4 vols. Paris 2004–7.

- Solomon of Basra, *The Book of the Bee*, ed. and tr. E.A.W. Budge. Oxford 1886.
- Soz. HE. Sozomen, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2nd ed., ed. J. Bidez, rev. G.C. Hansen, GCS. Berlin 1995. Fr tr. A.J. Festugière, B. Grillet, with notes by L. Angliviel de la Baumelle and G. Sabbah, SC 306, 418, 495, 516, 4 vols. Paris 1983–2008.
- Spic. Cas. *Spicilegium Casinense*, vol.1. Monte Cassino 1888.
- Spurious Life of Jacob Baradaeus, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, PO 19 (1925): 228–68.
- Strabo, *Geography*, ed. and tr. H.L. Jones, 8 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1917–32.
- Syn. Vet. *The Synodicon Vetus*, edd. and tr. J. Duffy and J. Parker, CFHB. Washington, D.C. 1979.
- Tabari, ed. M.J. de Goeje, vol.1. Leiden 1879. Ger. tr. T. Nöldeke, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden*. Leiden, 1879; tr. C.E. Bosworth, *The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakhmids, and Yemen*. Albany 1999. References give the page in de Goeje and then that in Bosworth.
- Thdrt. HE. Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. L. Parmentier, rev. G. Hansen, GCS. Berlin 1998. Fr. tr. P. Canivet, comm. A. Martin et al., SC 501, 530, 2 vols. Paris 2006–9.
- Thdrt. ep. *Correspondance*, ed. and tr. Y. Azéma, SC 40, 98, 111, 429, 4 vols. Paris 1955–98.
- Th. Lect. HE. Theodore Anagnostes (= Theodore Lector), *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. C. Hansen, GCS. Berlin 1995.
- Theod. *De situ*. Theodosius, *De situ terrae sanctae* in P.Geyer, ed., *Itinera Hierosolymitana saeculi IIII–VIII*, CSEL 39. Vienna 1898: 137–50.
- Theoph. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor. Leipzig 1883; tr. C. Mango and R. Scott, *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*. Oxford 1997. Page references are to de Boor's edition.
- Th. Sim. Theophylact Simocatta, *Historiae*, ed. C. de Boor, rev. P. Wirth. Stuttgart 1862. Tr. M. and M. Whitby. Oxford 1986; also tr. P. Schreiner. Stuttgart 1985.
- Tim. Ael. *Fragments*, ed. and tr. F. Nau, PO 13 (1919): 202–36.
- Tim. Ael. *Syriac Letters*, ed. and tr. Ebied and Wickham 1970: 332–69 (see in secondary sources below).
- Tim. Ael. *Widerlegung*, Timothy Aelurus, *Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalkedon festgesetzter Lehre* (in Armenian), ed. E. Ter-Mekertschian and E. Ter-Minassiantz, Leipzig 1908.
- Tim. Con. Timothy of Constantinople, *De iis qui ad ecclesiam accedunt*, ed. Cotelier in PG 86: 12–52.
- Vict. Tun. Victor of Tunnunna, *Chronicle*, ed. C. Cardelle de Hartmann, *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon cum reliquis ex consularibus caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarensis chronicon*, CCSL 173A. Turnhout 2001. Tr. J. Martyn, *Arians and Vandals of the 4th-6th centuries. Annotated translations of the historical works by bishops Victor of Vita (Historia Persecutionis Africanae Provinciae) and Victor of Tonnena (Chronicon), and of the religious works by bishop Victor of Cartenna (De Paenitentia) and saints Ambrose (De Fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos), and Athanasius (Expositio Fidei)*. Cambridge 2009.

- Vict. Vit. *Hist. Pers.* Victor of Vita, *Historia Persecutionis Africanae provinciae*, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 7. Vienna 1881. Tr. J. Moorhead, *History of the Vandal Persecution*, TTH. Liverpool 1992.
- V. Ioh. ep. Tell. Elias of Nisibis, *Vitae Iohannis episcopi Tellae* in *Vitae Virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, CSCO Scr. Syr. 7–8. Paris 1907.
- V. Isa. Zachariah of Mytilene, *Vita Isaiae monachi*, ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks in *Vitae Virorum apud Monophysitas Celeberrimorum*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 7–8. Louvain 1907: 3–16/3–10.
- V. Long. *Life of Longinus* in T. Orlandi, ed., *Vita dei monaci Phif et Longino*. Milan 1975; tr. T. Vivian, 'Humility and Resistance in Late Antique Egypt: The Life of Longinus', *Coptic Church Review* 20 (1999): 2–30.
- V. Petr. Iber. John Rufus: *The Lives of Peter the Iberian, Theodosius of Jerusalem, and the Monk Romanus*, ed. and tr. C. Horn and R. Phenix. Atlanta, GA, 2008. Also R. Raabe, ed. and Ger. tr., *Petrus der Iberer*. Leipzig 1895.
- V. Sym. Styl. Iun. *La vie ancienne de Syméon Stylite le jeune*, ed. and tr. P. van den Ven, *Subsidia Hagiographica* 32, 2 vols. Brussels 1962–70.
- V. Tim. Ael. *Life of Timothy Aelurus* in H.G. Evelyn White, *The monasteries of the Wadi'n Natrun*, vol.1. New York 1926: 164–7.
- Zach. *Antirrhexis*, ed. A. Demetrakopoulos, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, vol.1. Leipzig 1866: 1–4; also ed. J.B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra*, vol.5. Paris 1888: 67–70.
- Zach. *De opif. Mundi*. Zachariah of Mytilene, *De Opificio Mundi* in *Zacharia Scolastica*. Ammonio. *Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione, commentario*, M. Minniti Colonna. Naples 1973.
- Zach. V. Sev. Zachariah of Mytilene, *Life of Severus*, ed. and Fr. tr. M. Kugener, *PO* 2 (1903): 4–115; tr. L. Ambjörn, *The Life of Severus by Zachariah of Mytilene*. Piscataway 2008. References are to Kugener's edition and tr.
- Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene, *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, 4 vols., ed. and tr. E.W. Brooks, CSCO Scr. Syr. 38–9, 41–2. Paris 1919–24. Note also the earlier edition of J.P.N. Land, *Zachariae episcopi Mitylenes aliorumque scripta historica graece plerumque deperdita*, vol.3 of *Anecdota Syriaca* (pp.2–340). Leiden 1870.
- Zon. Zonaras, *Epitome Historiarum*, ed. L. Dindorf, vol.3. Leipzig 1870.
- Zos. Zosime, *Histoire Nouvelle*, ed. and tr. F. Paschoud, 6 vols. Paris 1979 (II, 1–2), 1986 (III, 1), 1989 (III, 2), 2000 (I, 2nd ed.). Eng. tr. R.T. Ridley, *Zosimus. New History*. Canberra 1982.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abramowski, L. 1965a. Review of de Halleux 1963, *RHE* 60: 859–66.
- Abramowski, L. 1965b. 'La prétendue condamnation de Diodore de Tarse en 499', *RHE* 60: 64–5.
- Adontz, N., tr. and rev. Garsoïan, N.G. 1970. *Armenia in the period of Justinian: The political conditions based on the 'Naxarar' system*. Lisbon.
- Akopjan, A.A. 1987. *Albanija-Aluank v greko-latinskikh i drevnearmjanskikh istochnikach*. Erevan.
- Alemaný, A. 2000. *Sources on the Alans. A Critical Companion*. Leiden.
- Alexidze, Z. and Blair, B. 2003. 'Caucasian Albanian Script: The Significance of decipherment', *Azerbaijan International* 11.3 (autumn), 56 pages (available on-line at http://azer.com/aiweb/categories/magazine/ai113_folder/113_articles/113_zaza_significance.html).
- Allen, P. 1980. 'Zachariah Scholasticus and the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Evagrius Scholasticus', *JTS* 31: 471–88.
- Allen, P. 1981. *Evagrius Scholasticus, the Church historian*. Louvain.
- Allen, P. 2000. 'The definition and enforcement of orthodoxy' in Cameron, Ward-Perkins and Whitby, eds.: 811–34.
- Allen, P. and Jeffreys, E., eds. 1996. *The Sixth Century. End or Beginning?* Brisbane.
- Allen, P. and Hayward, C. 2004. *Severus of Antioch*. Abingdon.
- Allen, P. and van Roey, A. 1994. *Monophysite Texts of the Sixth Century*. Louvain.
- Allgeier, A. 1927. Review of PZT and PZV, *BNJ* 4: 139–41.
- Altheim, F. 1959–60. *Geschichte der Hunnen*, vols.1–2. Berlin.
- Altheim, F. and Stiehl, R. 1957. *Finanzgeschichte der Spätantike*. Frankfurt.
- Amerise, M. 2005. *Il battesimo di Costantino il Grande. Storia di una scomoda eredità*. Stuttgart.
- Anastos, M. 1962. 'Nestorius was Orthodox', *DOP* 16: 117–40.
- Anastos, M. 1985. 'The Emperor Justin I's role in the restoration of Chalcedonian doctrine, 518–19', *Byzantina* 13: 127–39.
- Anderson, G. 1993. *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London.
- Anonymous. 1900. Review of AK and HB, *AnBoll* 19: 345.
- Antonopoulos, P. 1990. *Peter the Patrician, The Byzantine diplomat, official and author*. Athens.
- Arce, J. 1999. 'El inventario de Roma: *Curiosum y Notitia*' in Harris, W.V. ed., *The Transformation of Urbs Roma in late antiquity*. Portsmouth, RI: 15–22.
- Arjava, A. 2005. 'The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources', *DOP* 59: 73–94.
- Arzhantseva, I.A. 2007. 'The Alans: Neighbours of the Khazars in the Caucasus' in Golden et al., eds: 59–73.
- Ashbrook Harvey, S. 1988. 'Remembering Pain: Syriac historiography and the separation of the churches', *Byz* 58: 285–308.

- Ashbrook Harvey, S. 1990. *Asceticism and Society in Crisis. John of Ephesus and the Lives of the Eastern Saints*. Berkeley, CA.
- Assemani, J. 1721. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, vol.2. Rome.
- Assemani, J.S. and Assemani, S.E. 1759. *Bibliothecae apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus in tres partes distributus: in quarum prima orientales, in altera graeci, in tertia latini, italici aliorumque europaeorum idiomatum codices*, vol.3. Rome.
- Athanassiadi, P. 1999. See Damascius under primary sources above.
- Aubineau, M. 1971. 'Dossier patristique sur Jean XIX 23–24: La tunique sans couture du Christ', *Colloque de Strasbourg. La Bible et les Pères*. Paris: 9–50.
- Ausbüttel, F.M. 2003. *Theoderich der Große*. Darmstadt.
- Ayres, L. 2004. *Nicaea and Its Legacy*. Oxford.
- Bacht, H. 1953. 'Die Rolle des orientalischen Mönchtums' in Grillmeier and Bacht, vol.2.: 193–314.
- Bagnall, R., ed. 2007. *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700*. Cambridge.
- Bagrow, L. 1948. 'Supplementary Notices to "The origin of Ptolemy's Geographia"', *Imago Mundi* 4: 71–2.
- Baldwin, B. 1989. 'Illiterate Emperors', *Historia* 38: 124–6.
- Bardill, J. 2000. 'The church of Sts. Sergius and Bacchus in Constantinople and the Monophysite Refugees', *DOP* 54: 1–11.
- Barnes, T.D. 1981. *Constantine and Eusebius*. Cambridge, MA.
- Barnes, T.D. 1993. *Athanasius and Constantius*. Cambridge, MA.
- Barnes, T.D. 2006. Review of Gaddis 2006 in *JTS* 57: 720–5.
- Bauer, F.A. 1997. 'Das Bild der Stadt Rom in karolingischer Zeit: Der Anonymus Einsidlensis', *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 92: 190–228.
- Bauer, F.A. 2004. *Das Bild der Stadt Rom im Frühmittelalter*. Wiesbaden.
- Bauer, W. 1967. 'Die Severus-Vita des Zacharias Rhetor' in *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*: 210–28. Tübingen.
- Baumstark, A. 1922. *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*. Bonn.
- Bavant, B. 2007. 'Caricin Grad and the Changes in the Nature of Urbanism in the Central Balkans in the Sixth Century' in Poulter, ed.: 337–74.
- Beaucamp, J., Briquel-Chatonnet, F., Robin, C.J. 1999–2000. 'La persécution des chrétiens de Nagra et la chronologie himyarite', *Aram* 11–12: 15–83.
- Becker, A. 2006. *Fear of God and the Beginning of Wisdom. The School of Nisibis and Christian Scholastic Culture in Late Antique Mesopotamia*. Philadelphia.
- Becker, A. 2008. See Barhadbeshabba under primary sources.
- Becker, U. 1963. *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin*. Berlin.
- Bedjan, P., ed. 1903. *Homiliae S. Isaaci Antiocheni*. Paris.
- Behnsch, O. 1838, ed. and tr. *Rerum seculo quinto decimo in Mesopotamia gestarum*. Bratislava.
- Bell, G.L. 1911. *Amurath to Amurath*. London.
- Bell, P.N. 2009. *Three Political Voices from the Age of Justinian*, TTH. Liverpool.

- Behrwald, R. 2006. 'Les régionnaires de Rome: stratigraphies d'un texte', *CRAI*: 743–64.
- Behrwald, R. 2009. *Die Stadt als Museum? Die Wahrnehmung der Monumente Roms in der Spätantike*. Berlin.
- di Berardino, A. 2006. *Patrology: the Eastern Fathers from the Council of Chalcedon to John of Damascus (†750)*. Cambridge. [An English translation of *Patrologia*, vol.5, *Dal Concilio di Calcedonia (451) a Giovanni Damasceno (†750)*. I padri orientali. Genoa 2000.]
- Berger, A., ed. 2006. *Life and Works of Saint Gregentius, Archbishop of Taphar. Introduction, Critical edition and Translation*. Berlin.
- Berggren, J., Jones, A. 2000. *Ptolemy's Geography. An annotated translation of the theoretical chapters*. Princeton.
- Bevan, G. 2007. 'The Recall of Nestorius: Fact or Fiction?', *JCSSS* 7: 39–54.
- Bevan, G. and Gray, P.T.R. 2008. 'The Trial of Eutyches: A New Interpretation', *BZ* 101: 617–57.
- Bitton-Ashkelony, B. and Kofsky, A. 2006. *The Monastic School of Gaza*. Leiden.
- Blaudeau, P. 1996. 'Timothée Aelure et la direction ecclésiastique de l'empire post-chalcédonien', *REB* 54: 107–33.
- Blaudeau, P. 2001a. 'Le cas Pierre Monge au regard des sources monophysites d'origine palestinienne (fin Ve – début VIe s.)', *StPat* 37: 353–60.
- Blaudeau, P. 2001b. 'Mémoire monophysite et besoins chalcédoniens. Quelques réflexions sur les vestiges de l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* de Jean Diacrinoménos', *Adamantius* 7: 76–97.
- Blaudeau, P. 2003. 'Antagonismes et convergences: regard sur les interprétations confessantes du gouvernement d'un usurpateur, Basilisque (475–476)', *MedAnt* 6: 155–93.
- Blaudeau, P. 2006a. *Alexandrie et Constantinople (451–491). De l'histoire à la géo-ecclésiologie*. Rome.
- Blaudeau, P. 2006b. 'Rome contre Alexandrie? L'interprétation pontificale de l'enjeu monophysite (de l'émergence de la controverse eutychienne au schisme acacien 448–484)', *Adamantius* 12: 140–216.
- Blaudeau, P., ed. 2008a. *Exil et relégation. Les tribulations du sage et du saint durant l'antiquité romaine et chrétienne (Ier – VIe s. ap. J.-C.)*. Paris.
- Blaudeau, P. 2008b. 'Quand les papes parlent d'exil: l'affirmation d'une conception pontificale de la peine d'éloignement durant la controverse monophysite (449–523)' in Blaudeau 2008a: 273–308.
- Blázquez, J.M. 1998–9. 'La vida estudiantil en Beyruth y Alejandría a final del siglo V según la Vida de Severo de Zacarías Escolástico, I-II', *Gerión* 16: 415–36, 17: 519–30.
- Blockley, R.C. 1981–3. See *FCH* under abbreviations above.
- Blockley, R.C. 1985. See Menander Protector above.
- Blum, G.G. 1969. *Rabbula von Edessa. Der Christ, der Bischof, der Theologe*, CSCO Subs. 34. Louvain.

- Boerm, H. 2006. 'Der Perserkönig im *Imperium Romanum*: Chosroes I. und der sasanidische Einfall in das Oströmische Reich 540 n. Chr.', *Chiron* 36: 299–328.
- Boerm, H. 2007. *Prokop und die Perser*. Stuttgart.
- Bosworth, C.E. 1999. See Tabari under primary sources above.
- Bou Mansour, T. 2005. 'Les discours à caractère christologique et leur appartenance aux Isaac (d'Antioche)', *OrChr* 89: 8–42.
- Bovon, F. 2003. 'The dossier of Stephen, the first martyr', *HThR* 96: 279–315.
- Bowersock, G. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Brands, G. 2004. 'Ein Baukomplex in Dara-Anastasiopolis', *JAC* 47: 144–55.
- Braund, D. 1994. *Georgia in Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Bray, G., ed. 2000. *James, 1–2 Peter, 1–3 John, Jude. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament*, vol.11. Downers Grove, IL.
- Breccia, G. 2004. 'Salus Orientis. Il nuovo sistema militare romano-orientale alla prova, 379–400', *Riv. di Studi bizantini e neoellenici* 41: 3–72.
- Brennecke, H.C. 1998. 'Chalkedonense und Henotikon' in van Oort and Roldanus, eds: 24–53.
- Brière, M. 1960. 'Les homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche. Introduction générale à toutes les homélies', *PO* 29: 8–72.
- Brightman, F.E. 1896. *Liturgies eastern and western*, vol.1. Oxford.
- Brock, S.P. 1971. 'Some aspects of Greek words in Syriac' in A. Dietrich, ed., *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*. Göttingen: 80–108 (= 1984, IV).
- Brock, S.P. 1975. 'Some New Letters of the Patriarch Severus', *StPat* 12: 17–24.
- Brock, S.P. 1979–80. 'Syriac historical writing: a survey of the main sources', *Journal of the Iraqi Academy, Syriac Corporation* 5: 297–326 (= 1992, I, 1–30).
- Brock, S.P. 1981. 'The Conversations with the Syrian Orthodox under Justinian (532)', *OCP* 47: 87–121 (= 1992, XIII).
- Brock, S.P. 1984. *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London.
- Brock, S.P. 1985. 'The thrice-holy hymn in the Liturgy', *Sobornost* 7.2: 24–31.
- Brock, S.P. 1992. *Studies in Syriac Christianity*. Aldershot.
- Brock, S.P. 1993. 'From Annunciation to Pentecost: the travels of a technical term', *Studia Anselmiana* 110: 71–91.
- Brock, S.P. 2006. 'The origins of the *qanona* 'Holy God, holy Mighty, holy Immortal' according to Gabriel of Qatar (early 7th century)', *The Harp* 21: 173–85.
- Brock, S.P. 2007. 'Jacob of Serugh's poem on the Sleepers of Ephesus', in P.Allen, M.Franzmann, and R.Strelan, eds, '*I sowed fruits into hearts*' (*Od. Sol. 17:13*). *Festschrift for Michael Latke*, Early Christian Studies 12. Strathfield NSW: 13–30.
- Brock, S.P. and Ashbrook Harvey, S. 1987. *Holy Women of the Syriac Orient*. Berkeley.
- Brockelmann, C., rev. and tr. Sokoloff, M. 2009. *A Syriac lexicon: a translation from the Latin, correction, expansion, and update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon syriacum*. Piscataway, NJ.
- Brodka, D. and Stachura, M., eds. 2007. *Continuity and Change. Studies in Late*

- Antique Historiography. Electrum* 13. Krakow.
- Brooks, E.W. 1893. 'The Emperor Zenon and the Isaurians', *EHR* 8:209–38.
- Brooks, E.W. 1900. Review of AK, *JTS* 1: 620–3.
- Brooks, E.W. 1903. 'The dates of the Alexandrine patriarchs Dioskoros II, Timothy IV, and Theodosius', *BZ* 12: 494–7.
- Brooks, E.W. 1907. See the CSCO volume referred to under V. *Isa.* above.
- Brooks, E.W. 1918. *Joseph and Aseneth*. London.
- Bundy, D.D. 1978. 'Jacob Baradaeus. The state of research, a review of sources, and a new approach', *Muséon* 91: 45–86.
- Burchard, C. 1965. *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth*. Tübingen.
- Burchard, C. 1985. 'Joseph and Aseneth' in Charlesworth, J.H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigraphica*, vol.2. London: 177–247.
- Burchard, C., rev. Burfeind, C. 1996. *Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth*. Leiden.
- Burchard, C. 2003. *Joseph und Aseneth*. Leiden.
- Burgess, R.W. 1993. *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*. Oxford.
- Burgess, R.W. 1993/4. 'The Accession of Marcian in the Light of Chalcedonian Apologetic and Monophysite Polemic', *BZ* 86–7: 47–68.
- Burgess, R. W. 1999. *Studies in Eusebian and Post-Eusebian Chronography*. Historia Einzelschrift 135. Stuttgart.
- Burgess, R.W. 2000. 'Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti': The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular *Fasti* of the Roman Empire', *ZPE* 132: 259–90.
- Burgess, R. W. 2006. 'A Chronological Prolegomenon to Reconstructing Eusebius' *Chronici canones: The Evidence of Ps-Dionysius (the Zuqnin Chronicle)*', *JCSSS* 6: 29–38.
- Burgess, R.W. and Kulikowski, M. 2010. *Mosaics of Time. The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century B.C. to the Sixth Century A.D.*, vol.1, *A History of the Chronicle from the Ancient Near East to the European Middle Ages*. Turnhout.
- Bury, J.B. 1923. *A History of the Later Roman Empire from the death of Theodosius I to the death of Justinian*, 2 vols. London.
- Camelot, T. 1951. 'De Nestorius à Eutychès' in Grillmeier and Bacht, eds, vol.1: 213–42.
- Cameron, Alan. 1978. 'The House of Anastasius', *GRBS* 19: 259–76.
- Cameron, Alan. 2007. 'Poets and pagans in Byzantine Egypt' in Bagnall, ed.: 21–46.
- Cameron, Averil. 1969–70. 'Agathias on the Sassanians', *DOP* 23–4: 69–183.
- Cameron, Averil. 1980. 'The Sceptic and the Shroud', inaugural lecture at King's College, London, repr. in Cameron 1981, V.
- Cameron, Averil. 1981. *Continuity and Change in Sixth Century Byzantium*. London.
- Cameron, Averil. 1983. 'The History of the Image of Edessa: The telling of a story', *Okeanos = Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7: 80–94, repr. in Cameron 1996, XI.
- Cameron, Averil. 1989. 'Gelimer's Laughter: The Case of Byzantine North Africa'

- in F.M. Clover and R.S. Humphreys, eds, *Tradition and Innovation in Late Antiquity*. Madison, WI: 171–90.
- Cameron, Averil. 1993. *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity*, first ed. London.
- Cameron, Averil, ed. 1995. *Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam*, vol.3, *States, Resources, Armies*. Princeton.
- Cameron, Averil. 1996. *Changing Cultures in Early Byzantium*. Great Yarmouth.
- Cameron, Averil. 1998. 'The Mandylyon and Byzantine Iconoclasm' in Kessler and Wolf, eds: 33–54.
- Cameron, Averil. 2000a. 'Justin I and Justinian' in Cameron, Ward-Perkins and Whitby, eds: 63–85.
- Cameron, Averil. 2000b. 'Vandal and Byzantine North Africa' in Cameron, Ward-Perkins and Whitby, eds: 552–69.
- Cameron, Averil and Garnsey, P. 1998, eds. *CAH*, vol.13, *The Late Empire, 337–425*. Cambridge.
- Cameron, Averil, Ward-Perkins, B., Whitby, M. 2000, eds. *CAH*, vol.14, *Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, 425–600*. Cambridge.
- Camplani, A. 1989. *Le letteri festale di Atanasio di Alessandria*. Rome.
- Cantarelli, L. 1909. 'La serie dei Prefetti di Egitto, III. Dalla morte di Teodosio I alla conquista araba (395–642)', *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei*, fifth series, *Memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 14: 385–440.
- Capizzi, C. 1969. *L'imperatore Anastasio I*. Rome.
- Caquot, A. 1958. 'Appendice 3. Couvents antiques' in Tchalenko, G., *Villages antiques de la Syrie du nord*, vol.3. Paris: 63–85.
- Carcopino, J. 1933. 'Note complémentaire' in *CRAI*: 306–8.
- Carcopino, J. 1989. *La vie quotidienne à Rome à l'apogée de l'empire*, with a preface by Bloch, R. Paris.
- Carrié, J.-M. 1995. 'L'état à la recherche de nouveaux modes de financement des armées (Rome et Byzance, IVe–VIIIe siècles)' in Cameron, Averil, ed.: 27–60.
- Carta Paolucci, C. 1992. 'Teodosio di Alessandria nelle fonti calcedoniane e anticalcedoniane', *Studi e ricerche sull'Oriente Cristiano* 15: 49–66.
- Cavallera, F. 1909. 'Le dossier patristique de Timothée Aelure', *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*: 342–59.
- Chabot, J.-B. 1934. *Littérature syriaque*. Paris.
- Chadwick, H. 1955. 'The exile and death of Flavian of Constantinople: a prologue to the Council of Chalcedon', *JTS* 6: 17–34.
- Chadwick, H. 1983. 'The Chalcedonian Definition' in A.J. Festugière, *Actes du Concile de Chalcédoine. Sessions III–VI*. Geneva: 7–16 (= XVIII in Chadwick 1991).
- Chadwick, H. 1991. *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church*. Aldershot.
- Chadwick, H. 2001. *The Church in Ancient Society. From Galilee to Gregory the Great*. Oxford.
- Charanis, P. 1974. *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius I*, 2nd ed. Thessaloniki.

- Chastagnol, A. 1996. 'Les régionnaires de Rome' in C. Nicolet, ed., *Les littératures techniques dans l'antiquité romaine*. Geneva: 179–92.
- Chaumont, M.-L. 1985. 'Albania', *Elr* 1: 806–10.
- Chaumont, M.-L. 1986. 'Armenia and Iran II: The Pre-Islamic period', *Elr* 2: 418–38.
- Chesnut, R.C. 1976. *Three Monophysite Christologies*. Oxford.
- Chitty, D.J. 1966. *The Desert a City*. Oxford.
- Chitty, D.J. 1971. 'Abba Isaiah', *JTS* 22: 47–72.
- Christensen, A. 1944. *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2nd edition. Copenhagen.
- Chrysos, E. 1986. 'Antikaisar' in N. Stratou, ed., *Byzantium. Tribute to Andreas N. Stratos*, vol.1. Athens: 73–82.
- Chuvin, P. 1990. *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans*, tr. Archer, B.A. Cambridge, MA.
- Collinet, P. 1924. 'Une 'ville neuve' byzantine en 507: la fondation de Dara (Anastasiopolis) en Mésopotamie' in *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger*, vol.1. Paris: 55–60.
- Collinet, P. 1925. *Histoire de l'école de droit de Beyrouth* (vol.2 of *Études historiques sur le droit de Justinien*). Paris.
- Colonna, M. 1958. See Aeneas of Gaza under primary sources above.
- Colonna, M. Minniti. 1973. See Zach. *De opif. Mundi* in primary sources above.
- Coneybeare, F.C. 1905. 'Anecdota Monophysitarum', *American Journal of Theology* 9: 719–40.
- Connolly, R.H. 1912. 'The book of life', *JTS* 13: 580–94.
- Coakley, J.F. 1981. 'The old man Simeon (Luke 2,25) in Syriac tradition', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 47: 189–212.
- Cook, S.A. 1901. Review of HB, *EHR* 16: 748–9.
- Côté, D. 2006. 'Les deux sophistiques de Philostrate', *Rhetorica* 24: 1–35.
- Courcelle, P. 1948. *Les lettres grecques en Occident*. Paris.
- Courtois, C. 1955. *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*. Paris.
- Cowan, R.H. 2007. 'The clashing of weapons and silent advances in Roman battle', *Historia* 56: 114–17.
- Le Coz, R. 1993. *Histoire de l'Eglise de l'Orient*. Paris.
- Cribiore, R. 2007. 'Higher education in early Byzantine Egypt: Rhetoric, Latin, and the law' in Bagnall, ed.: 47–66.
- Croke, B. 1978. 'The date and circumstances of Marcian's death, A.D. 457', *Byzantion* 48: 5–9.
- Croke, B. 1984. 'Marcellinus on Dara: a fragment of his lost *de temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum*', *Phoenix* 38: 77–88.
- Croke, B. 1990. 'City Chronicles of Late Antiquity' in Clarke, G., ed., *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*. Rushcutters Bay: 165–203.
- Croke, B. 1995. See Marc. *com.* above under primary sources.
- Croke, B. 2001. *Count Marcellinus and his chronicle*. Oxford.
- Croke, B. 2005. 'Dynasty and Ethnicity: Emperor Leo I and the Eclipse of Aspar', *Chiron* 35: 147–203.

- Croke, B. 2006. 'Justinian, Theodora, and the church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus', *DOP* 60: 25–63.
- Croke, B. 2007. 'Justinian under Justin: reconfiguring a reign', *BZ* 100: 13–56.
- Crone, P. 1991. 'Kavad's heresy and Mazdak's revolt', *Iran* 29: 21–42.
- Crow, J. 2007. 'Amida and Tropaeum Traiani: a comparison of late antique fortress cities on the Lower Danube and Mesopotamia' in Poulter, ed.: 435–55.
- Czeglédý, K. 1957. 'The Syriac legend concerning Alexander the Great', *Acta Orientalia academiae scientiarum hungaricae* 7: 231–49.
- Czeglédý, K. 1961. 'Bemerkungen zur Geschichte der Chazaren', *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 13: 239–51.
- Czeglédý, K. 1971. 'Pseudo-Zacharias Rhetor on the Nomads', *Studia Turcica*. Budapest: 133–48.
- Dagron, G. 1974. *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*. Paris.
- Daley, B.E. 1995. 'Apollo as a Chalcedonian: a new fragment of a controversial work from early sixth-century Constantinople', *Traditio* 50: 31–54.
- Darmesteter, J. 1890. 'Jacques d'Édesse et Claude Ptolémée', *REG* 3: 180–8.
- Davis, S.J. 2004. *The Early Coptic Papacy. The Egyptian Church and Its Leadership in Late Antiquity*. Cairo/New York.
- Debié, M. 1999/2000. 'Record keeping and chronicle writing in Antioch and Edessa', *Aram* 11–12: 409–17.
- Debié, M. 2003. 'Du grec en syriaque: la transmission du récit de la prise d'Amid (502) dans l'historiographie byzantine', *BZ* 96: 601–22.
- Debié, M. 2004a. 'Jean Malalas et la tradition chronographique de langue syriaque' in J. Beaucamp et al., eds. *Recherches sur la chronique de Jean Malalas*, I. Paris: 147–64.
- Debié, M. 2004b. 'Place et image d'Antioche chez les historiens syro-occidentaux', *Topoi*, Suppl.5: 155–70.
- Debié, M. 2006. 'L'héritage de la chronique d'Eusèbe dans l'historiographie syriaque', *JCSSS* 6: 18–28.
- Debié, M., ed. 2009a. *L'historiographie syriaque*. Paris.
- Debié, M. 2009b. 'L'héritage de l'historiographie grecque' in Debié, ed.: 11–31.
- Debié, M. 2011. *L'Écriture de l'histoire en syriaque: transmission interculturelle et construction identitaire entre hellénisme et islam*. Louvain.
- De Blois, F. 1990. 'The date of the "martyrs of Najran"', *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 1: 110–28.
- De Boor, C. 1880. See Niceph. under primary sources above.
- De Durand, G.-M. 2002. 'Sources et signification de Chalcédoine (451)', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 86: 369–86.
- De Halleux, A. 1962. 'Nouveaux textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabbog I', *Muséon* 75: 31–62.
- De Halleux, A. 1963. *Philoxène de Mabbog. Sa vie, ses écrits, sa théologie*. Louvain.

- De Halleux, A. 1975–6. 'Une notice syro-chalcédonienne sur Sévère d'Antioche', *PdO* 6–7 (1975–6): 461–77.
- De Halleux, A. 1975/6. 'A la source d'une biographie expurgée de Philoxène' in P. Naster, ed., *Miscellanea in honorem Josephi Vergote*, *OLP* 6/7: 253–66.
- De Halleux, A. 1978. 'La chronique melkite abrégée de MS. Sinaï syr.10', *Muséon* 91: 5–44.
- De Halleux, A. 1982. 'L'homélie baptismale de Grégoire de Naziance', *Muséon* 95: 5–40.
- De Halleux, A. 1983. 'La deuxième lettre de Philoxène aux monastères du Beit Gaugali', *Muséon* 96: 5–79.
- De Lange, N. 2005. 'Jews in the Age of Justinian' in Maas, ed.: 401–26.
- Delmas, F. 1899–1900. 'Zacharie le Rhéteur d'après un ouvrage récent', *Échos d'Orient* 3: 36–40.
- Demandt, A. 2008. *Geschichte der Spätantike*, 2nd ed. Munich.
- Demicheli, A.M. 1983. 'La politica religiosa di Giustiniano in Egitto', *Aegyptus* 63: 217–57.
- Den Boeft, J., Drijvers, J.W., den Hengst, D., Teitler, H.C. 2005. *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus XXV*. Leiden.
- Detoraki, M. 2007. See *Martyrium Arethae* under primary sources.
- Devos, P. 1974. 'Quelques aspects de la nouvelle lettre récemment découverte, de Simeon de Bêth Arshâm sur les martyrs Himyarites' in *IV Congress Internazionale di Studi Etiopici*, vol.1. Rome: 107–16.
- Devreesse, R. 1930. 'Les premières années du monophysisme', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 19: 251–65.
- Dickens, M. 2008. 'Turkâyê: Turkic Peoples in Syriac Literature Prior to the Seljûks' Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge.
- Diekamp, F. 1907. *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des siebenten und achten Jahrhunderts*. Münster.
- Diekamp, F. 1938. *Analecta Patristica*. OCA 117. Rome.
- Diepen, H.-M. 1955. 'Les douze anathématismes au Concile d'Ephèse et jusqu'en 519', *Revue thomiste* 55: 300–38.
- Dignas, B. and Winter, E. 2007. *Rome and Persia in Late Antiquity. Neighbours and Rivals*. Cambridge.
- Dijkstra, J.H.F. 2008. *Philae and the End of Ancient Egyptian Religion*. Louvain.
- Dijkstra, J.H.F. and Greatrex, G. 2009. 'Patriarchs and politics in Constantinople in the reign of Anastasius (with a Reedition of *O. Mon. Epiph.* 59)', *Millennium* 6: 223–64.
- Dillemann, L. 1962. *Haute Mésopotamie et pays adjacents*. Paris.
- Di Segni, L. 1995. 'The involvement of local, municipal and provincial authorities in urban building in late antique Palestine and Syria' in Humphrey, J., ed., *The Roman and Byzantine Near East*, vol.1. Portsmouth, RI: 312–32.
- Dobschütz, E. von. 1899. *Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende*, 3 vols. TU 18. Leipzig.

- Dölger, F. 1949. 'Das Kaiserjahr der Byzantiner', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl., Jahrgang 1949. Munich.
- Doran, R. 2006. *Stewards of the Poor. The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa*. Kalamazoo, MI.
- Dovere, E. 1985. 'L'ἐγκύκλιον Βασιλίσκου. Un caso di normativa imperiale in oriente su temi di dogmatica teologica', *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 51: 153–88.
- Dovere, E. 1988. 'L'Enotico di Zenone Isaurico. Preteso intervento normativo tra politica religiosa e pacificazione sociale', *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 54: 170–90.
- Downey, G. 1961. *A History of Antioch in Syria*. Princeton.
- Draguet, R. 1924. *Julien d'Halicarnasse*. Louvain.
- Draguet, R. 1927a. 'Une pastorale antijulianiste des environs de l'année 530', *Muséon* 40: 75–92.
- Draguet, R. 1927b. Review of PZV and PZT, *Muséon* 40: 316–17.
- Draguet, R. 1928. 'Le florilège antichalcédonien du Vatic. Graec. 1431', *RHE* 24: 51–62.
- Draguet, R. 1931. 'La christologie d'Eutychès', *Byz* 6: 441–57.
- Draguet, R. 1968. *Les cinq révisions de l'ascéticon syriaque d'abba Isaïe, I. Introduction au problème isaïen. Version des logoi I-XIII avec des parallèles grecs et latins*. CSCO Scr. Syr.122. Louvain.
- Drijvers, H.J.W. 1996. 'The Man of God of Edessa, Bishop Rabbula, the Urban Poor. Church and Society in the Fifth Century', *JECS* 4: 235–48.
- Drijvers, H.J.W. 1998. 'The image of Edessa in the Syriac Tradition' in Kessler and Wolf, eds: 13–31.
- Drijvers, H.J.W. and Drijvers, J.W., eds. and tr. 1997. *The Finding of the True Cross. The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac*. CSCO Subs. 93. Louvain.
- Drijvers, J.W. 1997. 'The Protonike Legend, the *Doctrina Addai* and bishop Rabbula of Edessa', *VigChrist* 51: 298–315.
- Drinkwater, J., and Salway, B., eds. 2007. *Wolf Liebeschuetz Reflected*. London.
- Duchesne, L. 1925. *L'Église au VI^e siècle*. Paris.
- Dudko, D.M. 2001–2. 'Mythological Ethnography of Eastern Europe: Herodotus, Pseudo-Zacharias, and Nestor', *Anthropology and Archeology of Eurasia* 40: 75–92.
- Durliat, J. 1981. *Les dédicaces d'ouvrages de défense dans l'Afrique byzantine*. Paris.
- Dussaud, R. 1927. *Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale*. Paris.
- Duval, R. 1900. Review of AK and HB, *JA* 9.15: 384–8.
- Duval, R. 1907. *La littérature syriaque*, 3rd ed. Paris.
- D'yakonov, A. 1939. 'Izvestija Psevdo-Zakharij o drevnikh slavjanakh', *Vestnik drevnij istorii* 9: 83–90.
- Ebied, R.Y. and Wickham, L.R. 1970. 'A collection of unpublished Syriac letters of Timothy Aelurus', *JTS* 21: 321–69.
- Ebied, R.Y. and Wickham, L.R. 1972. 'A note on the Syriac version of Athanasius'

- Ad Epictetum*, *JTS* 23: 144–54.
- Ebied, R.Y. and Wickham, L.R. 1985. 'Timothy Aelurus against the definition of the Council of Chalcedon' in Laga, Munitiz and van Rompay, eds.: 115–66.
- Eißenfeld, O. 1950. 'Baalbek', *RAC* 1: 1113–18.
- Elliott, J.K. 1993. *The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford.
- Elton, H. 2000a. 'The nature of the sixth-century Isaurians' in Mitchell and Greatrex, eds: 293–308.
- Elton, H. 2000b. 'Illus and the imperial aristocracy under Zeno', *Byzantion* 70: 393–407.
- Engberding, H. 1953. 'Wann wurde Severus zum Patriarchen von Antiochien geweiht?', *OrChr* 37: 132–4.
- Ensslin, W. 1927. 'Zur Gründungsgeschichte von Dara-Anastasiopolis', *BNJ* 5: 342–7.
- Evans, J.A.S. 1996. *Justinian. The circumstances of imperial power*. London.
- Evans, J.A.S. 2002. *The Empress Theodora, Partner of Justinian*. Austin, TX.
- Evans, J.A.S. 2005. *The Emperor Justinian and the Byzantine Empire*. Westport, CT-London.
- Eviex, P. 1995. *Isidore de Péluse*. Paris.
- Farquharson, P. 1996. 'Planet Earth and the Solar System in the Sixth Century' in Allen and Jeffreys, eds: 263–9.
- Farrokh, K. 2005. *Sasanian Elite Cavalry, A.D. 224–642*. Oxford.
- Feissel, D. 2002a. 'Les itinéraires de Procope et la métrologie de l'antiquité tardive', *AnTar* 10: 383–400.
- Feissel, D. 2002b. 'Les martyria d'Anasarthas', *TM* 14: 201–20.
- Feld, K. 2005. *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich*. Berlin.
- Festugière, A.J. 1975. 'Évagre, Histoire Ecclésiastique', *Byzantion* 45: 187–488.
- Fiey, J.-M. 1970. *Jalons pour une histoire de l'église en Iraq*. CSCO 310. Louvain.
- Fiey, J.-M. 1977. *Nisibe, métropole syriaque orientale et ses suffragants des origines à nos jours*. CSCO 388. Louvain.
- Fiey, J.-M. 2004, ed. Conrad, L.I. *Saints syriaques*. Princeton.
- Flemming, J. 1917. *Acts Eph. II* under primary sources.
- Flemming, J. and Lietzmann, H. 1904. *Apollinaristische Schriften syrisch, Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl., N.F. 7.4. Berlin.
- Flusin, B. 1996. 'L'hagiographie palestinienne et la réception du concile de Chalcedoine' in Rosenqvist, J.O., ed., *Leimôn. Studies Presented to Lennart Rydén on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Uppsala: 25–47.
- Flusin, B. 1998. 'Évêques et patriarches – les structures de l'église impériale' in Pietri, ed.: 485–543.
- Flusin, B. 2005. Preface of Saliou, ed.: ix–xii.
- Foss, C. 2002. 'The Empress Theodora', *Byzantion* 72: 141–76.
- Fowden, G. 1994a. 'Constantine, Silvester and the church of S. Polyeuctus in Constantinople', *JRA* 7: 274–84.
- Fowden, G. 1994b. 'The Last Days of Constantine: Oppositional Versions and their

- Influence', *JRS* 84: 146–70.
- Fraenkel, S. 1902. 'Bemerkungen zu syrischen Texten', *ZDMG* 56: 98–100.
- Fraisse-Coué, F. 1995. 'Le débat théologique au temps de Théodose II: Nestorius' in Pietri and Pietri, eds: 499–555.
- Fraisse-Coué, F. 1998a. 'D'Éphèse à Chalcédoine: «la paix trompeuse» (433–451) in Pietri, ed.: 9–77.
- Fraisse-Coué, F. 1998b. 'L'incompréhension croissante entre l'Orient et l'Occident (451–518)' in Pietri, ed.: 147–96.
- Fraser, P.M. 1951. 'A Syriac *Notitia Urbis Alexandrinae*', *JEA* 37: 103–8.
- Freeman, P. and Kennedy, D., eds. 1986. *The Defence of the Roman and Byzantine East*. Oxford.
- French, D. and Lightfoot, C., eds. 1989. *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Freund, W.H.C. 1972. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. Cambridge.
- Freund, W.H.C. 1973. 'Severus of Antioch and the origins of the Monophysite hierarchy' in Neiman, D. and Schatkin, M., eds, *The Heritage of the Early Church*, *OCA* 195. Rome: 261–75.
- Freund, W.H.C. 1979. 'The Fall of Macedonius in 511 - A Suggestion', in Ritter, A.M., ed., *Kerygma und Logos. Festschrift für Carl Andresen*. Göttingen: 183–95.
- Gabriel, A. 1940. *Voyages archéologiques dans la Turquie orientale*, 2 vols. Paris. All references are to vol.1.
- Gaddis, M. 2006. *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ. Religious Violence in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley.
- Gaddis, M. and Price, R. 2005. See *Acts Chalc.* under primary sources.
- Galtier, P. 1951. 'Saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie et saint Léon le Grand à Chalcédoine' in Grillmeier and Bacht, vol.1: 345–87.
- Garitte, G. 1966. 'Textes hagiographiques orientaux relatifs à saint Léonce de Tripoli II. L'homélie copte de Sévère d'Antioche', *Muséon* 79: 335–86.
- Garsoïan, N.G. 1989. *The Epic Histories attributed to P'awstos Buzand (Buzandaran Patmut'iwkn')*. Cambridge, MA.
- Garsoïan, N.G. 1999. *L'église arménienne et le grand schisme d'Orient*, CSCO Subs.100. Louvain.
- Gascou, J. 1976. 'L'institution des bucellaires', *BIFAO* 76: 143–56.
- Gascou, J. 2007. 'Les origines du culte des saints Cyr et Jean', *AnBoll* 125: 241–81.
- Gautier Dalché, P. 2009. *La géographie de Ptolémée en Occident (Ive–XVIe siècle)*. Turnhout.
- Gelzer, H. 1880–98. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*, 2 vols. Leipzig.
- Gelzer, H. 1883. Review of A. Freund, *Beiträge zur antiochenischen und konstantinopolitanischen Stadtchronik*, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 26: 500–12.
- Gelzer, H. 1892. 'Josua Stylites und die damaligen kirchlichen Parteien des Orients', *BZ* 1: 34–49.

- Gelzer, H. and Nöldeke, T. 1892. 'Die Synoden von Sidon und Tyrus', *BZ* 1: 333–5.
- Gerö, S. 1993. 'The legend of Alexander the Great in the Christian Orient', *BJRL* 75.1: 3–9.
- Ginter, K. 2001. 'Historia Ecclesiastica of Evagrius Scholasticus as an example of interaction between the monophysite and Chalcedonian traditions in the sixth century', *AHC* 33: 1–8.
- Gippert, J., Schulze, W., Aleksidze, Z., Mahé, J.-P. 2009. *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai*. Turnhout.
- Glucker, C.A.M. 1987. *The City of Gaza in the Roman and Byzantine Period*. Oxford.
- Goffart, W. 2006. *Barbarian Tides. The Migration Age and the Later Roman Empire*. Philadelphia.
- Golden, P.B. 1990a. 'The peoples of the Russian forest belt', *CHEIA*: 229–55.
- Golden, P.B. 1990b. 'The peoples of the south Russian steppes', *CHEIA*: 256–84.
- Golden, P.B. 1992. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden.
- Golden, P.B. 2007. 'Khazar Studies: Achievements and Perspectives' in Golden et al., eds.: 7–57.
- Golden, P.B., Ben-Shammai, H., Róna-Tas, A., eds. 2007. *The World of the Khazars. New Perspectives. Selected Papers from the Jerusalem 1999 International Khazar Colloquium*. Leiden.
- Goldsworthy, A.K. 1996. *The Roman Army at War*. Oxford.
- Goldsworthy, A.K. 2003. *The Complete Roman Army*. London.
- Goldsworthy, A.K. 2009. *The Fall of the West. The death of the Roman superpower*. London.
- Goltz, A. 2008. *Barbar – König – Tyrann. Das Bild Theoderichs des Grossen in der Überlieferung des 5. bis 9. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin.
- Goltz, A. 2009. 'Das „Ende“ des Weströmischen Reiches in der frühbyzantinischen syrischen Historiographie' in Goltz, A., Leppin, H., Schlange-Schöningen, H., eds, *Jenseits der Grenzen. Beiträge zur spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Geschichtsschreibung*. Berlin: 169–98.
- Goodblatt, D.M. 1979. 'The polltax in Sasanian Babylonia: the Talmudic evidence', *JESHO* 22: 233–95.
- Gordini, G.D. 1968. 'Stefano, protomartire. III. Invenzione delle reliquie, IV. Il Culto', *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, vol.11. Rome: 1380–7.
- Graumann, T. 2009. 'Reading' the first Council of Ephesus (431)' in Price and Whitby, eds: 27–44.
- Gray, P.T.R. 1979. *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East*. Leiden.
- Gray, P.T.R. 1988. 'Forgery as an instrument of progress: reconstructing the theological tradition in the sixth century', *BZ* 81: 284–9.
- Gray, P.T. R. 1997. 'Covering the nakedness of Noah: reconstruction and denial in the age of Justinian', *ByzF* 24: 193–206.
- Gray, P.T.R. 2005. 'The Legacy of Chalcedon: Christological Problems and Their Significance' in Maas, ed.: 215–38.
- Gray, P.T.R. 2006. See Leontius under primary sources.

- Greatrex, G. 1994. 'Procopius and the Persian Wars', D. Phil. thesis. Oxford.
- Greatrex, G. 1995. 'The composition of Procopius' *Persian Wars* and John the Cappadocian', *Prudentia* 27: 1–13.
- Greatrex, G. 1996a. 'Flavius Hypatius, *quem vidit validum Parthus sensitque timendum*: an investigation of his career', *Byz* 66: 120–42.
- Greatrex, G. 1996b. 'Stephanus, the father of Procopius of Caesarea?', *Medieval Prosopography* 17: 125–45.
- Greatrex, G. 1997. 'The Nika riot: a reappraisal', *JHS* 117: 60–86.
- Greatrex, G. 1998. *Rome and Persia at War: 502–532*. Leeds.
- Greatrex, G. 2001a. 'Justin I and the Arians', *StPat* 38: 71–81.
- Greatrex, G. 2001b. 'Lawyers and Historians in Late Antiquity' in Mathisen, R., ed., *Law, Authority and Power in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: 148–61.
- Greatrex, G. 2003. 'Khusro II and the Christians of his empire', *JCSSS* 3: 78–88.
- Greatrex, G. 2005. 'Byzantium and the East in the Sixth Century' in Maas, ed.: 477–509.
- Greatrex, G. 2006. 'Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene: the context and nature of his work', *JCSSS* 6: 39–52.
- Greatrex, G. 2007a. 'The early years of Justin I in the sources', *Electrum* 12: 99–113.
- Greatrex, G. 2007b. 'Moines, militaires et défense de la frontière orientale au VIe s.', in Lewin and Pellegrini: 285–97.
- Greatrex, G. 2007c. 'Dukes of the eastern frontier' in Drinkwater and Salway, eds.: 87–98.
- Greatrex, G. 2008. 'Political-historical survey, c.250–518' in Jeffreys, ed.: 232–48.
- Greatrex, G. 2009. 'Le pseudo-Zacharie de Mytilène et l'historiographie syriaque au VIe siècle' in Debié, ed.: 33–55.
- Greatrex, G. 2010. 'The downfall of Macedonius reconsidered', *StPat* 44: 125–9.
- Greatrex, G. Forthcoming. 'Procopius and Pseudo-Zachariah on the siege of Amida and its aftermath (502–6)', in Boerm, H., and Wiesehöfer, J., eds, *Commutatio et Contentio*, Düsseldorf.
- Greatrex, G. and Lieu, S.N.C. 2002. *The Roman Eastern Frontier and the Persian Wars, A.D. 363–630*. London.
- Green, B. 2008. *The Soteriology of Leo the Great*. Oxford.
- Gregory, S.E. 1997. *Roman Military Architecture on the Eastern Frontier*, 3 vols. Amsterdam.
- Gregory, T.E. 1979. *Vox populi. Popular Opinion and Violence in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century A.D.* Columbus.
- Gribomont, J. 1975–6. 'La catéchèse de Sévère d'Antioche et le Credo', *PdO* 6–7: 125–58.
- Grillmeier, A. 1963. 'Ephrem' in *DHGE* xv: 581–5.
- Grillmeier, A. *Jesus Christus im Glauben der Kirche*, vol.i (1990/2004), ii.1 (1991), ii.2 (1989/2004, with T. Hainthaler), ii.3 (2002, with T. Hainthaler), ii.4 (1990/2004, with T. Hainthaler). Freiburg-Basel-Vienna. The work is translated into English as *Christ in Christian Tradition*; translations have appeared

- as follows: vol.i (1975), ii.1 (1987), ii.2 (1995), ii.4 (1996). Oxford. Given that some updating of the original German has been made and that no English translation of ii.3 had appeared at the time of writing, we refer to the work by volume number with the German pagination first, then the English.
- Grillmeier, A. and Bacht, H., eds. 1951–3. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, vols.1–2. Würzburg.
- Grimm, V.E. 1996. *From feasting to fasting: the evolution of a sin*. London.
- Gruen, E. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism*. Berkeley, CA.
- Grumel, V. 1958. *La Chronologie*. Paris.
- Grumel, V. 1972. *Les registres des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, vol.1, 2nd ed. Paris.
- Guidi, I. 1881. ‘La lettera di Simeone vescovo di Bêth-Arsâm sopra i martiri omeriti’, *Atti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei: Memorie della Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 7: 471–515.
- Guidi, I. 1884. ‘Il testo siriano della descrizione di Roma, nella storia attribuita a Zaccaria Retore’, *Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma* 12: 218–39.
- Guidi, I. 1884–5. *Testi orientali sopra i sette dormienti di Efeso*, Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Anno 282. Rome.
- Guidi, I. 1886. ‘Mose di Aghel e Simeone Abbate’, *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei* IV.2: 397–416.
- Guidi, I. 1891. ‘Di un nuovo manoscritto del Breviarium siriano’, *Bullettino della commissione archeologica di Roma* 19: 61–9.
- Guidi, I. 1904. ‘Textes orientaux inédits. Du martyre de Judas Cyriaque, évêque de Jérusalem’, *ROC* 9: 79–95.
- Guilland, R. 1976. *Titres et fonctions de l’Empire byzantin*. London.
- Gwynn, D. 2009. ‘The Council of Chalcedon and the definition of Christian tradition’ in Price and Whitby, eds: 7–26.
- Gwynn, J. 1909. *Remnants of the later Syriac versions of the Bible*. London.
- Haacke, R. 1953. ‘Die kaiserliche Politik in den Auseinandersetzungen um Chalkedon (451–553)’ in Grillmeier and Bacht, eds., vol.2: 95–177.
- Haarer, F.K. 2006. *Anastasius I. Politics and Empire in the late Roman world*. Cambridge.
- Haas, C. 1993. ‘Patriarch and People: Peter Mongus of Alexandria and Episcopal Leadership in the Fifth Century’, *JECS* 1: 297–316.
- Haas, C. 1997. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity. Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore.
- Haase, F. 1908. ‘Patriarch Dioskur I. von Alexandrien nach monophysitischen Quellen’, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, ed. M. Sladek, 6: 145–236. Breslau.
- Haase, F. 1925. *Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen*. Leipzig.
- Hadas, M. 1951. See Aristeas under primary sources above.

- Hainthaler, T. 1997. 'Bemerkungen zur Christologie des Ps.-Dionys und ihrer Nachwirkung im 6. Jahrhundert' in Y. de Andia, ed., *Denys l'Aréopagite*. Paris: 269–92.
- Hainthaler, T. 2007. *Christliche Araber vor dem Islam*. Louvain.
- Hajjar, J. 1969. *Le synode permanent dans l'église byzantine des origines au XIe siècle*, OCA 164. Rome.
- Haldon, J. 2001. *The Byzantine Wars*. Stroud.
- Haldon, J. 2008. 'Political-historical survey, 518–800' in Jeffreys, ed.: 249–63.
- Hall, S.G. 2002. 'Typologie' in *TRE* 34: 208–24.
- de Halleux, A. See under D above.
- Hallier, L. 1892. *Untersuchungen über die edessenische Chronik*, TU 9–1A. Leipzig.
- Halsall, G. 2007. *Barbarian Migrations and the Roman West, 376–568*. Cambridge.
- Hannestad, K. 1955–7. 'Les relations de Byzance avec la Transcaucasie et l'Asie centrale aux 5^{ème} et 6^{ème} siècles', *Byz* 25–7: 421–56.
- Harvey, S. Ashbrook. See under Ashbrook Harvey above.
- Hasagaro, I. 1980. 'Catalogue of Ancient and Naked-Eye Comets', *Vistas in Astronomy* 24: 59–102.
- Hatlie, P. 2007. *The Monks and Monasteries of Constantinople, ca.350–850*. Cambridge.
- Haussig, H.W. 1953. 'Theophylakts Exkurs über die skythischen Völker', *Byz* 23: 275–462.
- Heather, P.J. 1991. *Goths and Romans, 332–489*. Oxford.
- Heather, P.J. 1996. *The Goths*. Oxford.
- Heather, P.J. 2000. 'The Western Empire, 425–476' in Cameron, Ward-Perkins and Whitby, eds: 1–32.
- Hefele, C.J. and Leclercq, H. 1907. *Histoire des Conciles*, vol.1.1. Paris.
- Henninger, J. 1958. 'Menschenopfer bei den Arabern', *Anthropos* 53: 721–805.
- Hermansen, G. 1978. 'The population of imperial Rome: the regionaries', *Historia* 27: 129–68.
- Hespel, R. 1955. *Le florilège cyrillien réfuté par Sévère d'Antioche. Étude et édition critique*. Louvain.
- Hewsen, R. 1964. 'On the alphabet of the Caucasian Albanians', *REArm* 1: 427–32.
- Hewsen, R. 1971. 'The Geography of Pappus of Alexandria: A Translation of the Armenian fragments', *Isis* 62: 186–207.
- Hewsen, R. 1988–9. 'Introduction to Armenian historical geography IV: The Vitaxates of Arsacid Armenia. A reexamination of the territorial aspects of the institution (part one)', *REArm* 21: 271–319.
- Hewsen, R. 1992. *The Geography of Ananias of Širak (Ašxarac'oyc')*. *The Long and Short Recensions*. Wiesbaden.
- Hewsen, R. 2001. *Armenia. A historical atlas*. Chicago.
- Hild, F. and Hellenkemper, H. 1990. *Kilikien und Isaurien, Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, vol. 5. Vienna.
- Hilgenfeld, H. 1904. Review of HB, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 47: 573–6.

- Ho Peng Yoke, 1962. 'Ancient and mediaeval observations of Comets and Novae in Chinese Sources', *Vistas in Astronomy* 5: 127–225.
- Hofmann, F. 1953. 'Der Kampf der Päpste um Konzil und Dogma von Chalkedon von Leo dem Grossen bis Hormisdas (451–519)' in Grillmeier and Bacht, eds.: 13–94.
- Höfner, M. 1950. 'Arabien', *RAC* 1: 575–85.
- Holum, K.G. 1982. *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Holum, K.G. 2005. 'The classical city in the sixth century' in Maas, ed.: 87–112.
- Hommes et Richesses dans l'Empire byzantin, IVe-VIIe siècle*, 2 vols. Paris 1989.
- Homo, L. 1933. 'Topographie et Démographie dans la Rome impériale', *CRAI*: 293–305.
- Homo, L. 1951. *Rome impériale et l'urbanisme dans l'antiquité*. Paris.
- Honigmann, E. 1922. 'Nordsyrische Klöster in vorarabischer Zeit', *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 1: 15–33.
- Honigmann, E. 1923. *Historische Topographie von Nordsyrien im Altertum*. Leipzig.
- Honigmann, E. 1929. *Die sieben Klimata und die poleis episèmoi*. Heidelberg.
- Honigmann, E. 1935. *Die Ostgrenze des Byzantinischen Reiches*. Brussels. (= part III of A.A. Vasiliev, *Byzance et les Arabes*).
- Honigmann, E. 1950. 'Juvenal of Jerusalem', *DOP* 5: 211–79.
- Honigmann, E. 1951. *Évêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VIe siècle*. Louvain.
- Honigmann, E. 1953a. *Patristic Studies*, Studi e Testi 173. Vatican City.
- Honigmann, E. 1953b. 'Anthimus of Trebizond' in Honigmann 1953a: 185–93.
- Honigmann, E. 1953c. 'Zacharias of Mitylene' in Honigmann 1953a: 194–204.
- Honigmann, E. 1953d. 'Stephen of Ephesus (April 15, 448 – Oct. 29, 451) and the legend of the seven sleepers' in Honigmann 1953a: 125–68.
- Honigmann, E. and Maricq, A. 1953. *Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis*. Brussels.
- Honigmann, E. 1954. *Le couvent de Barsauma et le patriarcat jacobite d'Antioche*, CSCO Subs. 7. Louvain.
- Horden, P. 2005. 'Mediterranean Plague in the Age of Justinian' in Maas, ed.: 134–60.
- Horn, C. 2003. 'Peter the Iberian and Palestinian Anti-Chalcedonian Monasticism in Fifth-and Early-Sixth Century Gaza', *Aram* 15: 109–28.
- Horn, C. 2004. 'Empress Eudocia and the Monk Peter the Iberian: Patronage, Pilgrimage, and the Love of a Foster-Mother in Fifth-Century Palestine', *ByzF* 28: 197–213.
- Horn, C. 2006. *Asceticism and Christological Controversy in Fifth-Century Palestine. The Career of Peter the Iberian*. Oxford.
- Horn, C. and Phenix, R. 2008. See *V. Petr. Iber.* under primary sources above.
- Horn, C. and Phenix, R. 2011. See *Rabbula Corpus* under primary sources above.
- Howard-Johnston, J.D. 1989. 'Procopius, Roman defences north of the Taurus and the new fortress at Citharizon' in French and Lightfoot, eds: 203–28.

- Hoyland, R.G. 2001. *Arabia and the Arabs. From the Bronze Age to the Coming of Islam*. London.
- Hugonnard-Roche, H. 1989. 'Aux origines de l'exégèse orientale de la logique d'Aristote: Sergius de Reš'aina († 536), médecin et philosophe', *JA* 277: 1–17.
- Hugonnard-Roche, H. 1997. 'Notes sur Sergius de Reš'aina, traducteur du grec en syriaque et commentateur d'Aristote' in G. Endress and R. Kruk, eds, *The Ancient Tradition in Christian and Islamic Hellenism. Studies on the transmission of Greek philosophy and sciences: dedicated to H.J. Drossaart Lulofs on his 90th birthday*. Leiden: 121–43.
- Inowlocki, S. 2002. *Des idoles mortes et muettes au dieu vivant*. Turnhout.
- Jackson, S.M. 1900. Review of AK, *American Journal of Theology* 4: 433–4.
- Janeras, S. 2001. 'Le Trisagion: une formule brève en liturgie comparée' in Taft, R.G. and Winkler, G., eds, *Acts of the International Congress: Comparative Liturgy Fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948), Rome, 25–29 September 1998*, OCA 265. Rome: 495–562.
- Janin, R. 1964. *Constantinople byzantine*. Paris.
- Janin, R. 1969. *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin. I. Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. III. Les églises et les monastères*, 2nd ed. Paris.
- Janniard, S. 2003. Review of Greatrex and Lieu 2002, *AnTard* 11: 367–9.
- Jansma, T. 1965. 'Credo (Encore le) de Jacques de Saroug', *L'Orient syrien* 10: 75–88, 193–236, 331–70, 475–510.
- Janson, A.G.P., van Rompay, L., 1989. 'Syriac studies in Leiden (1850–1940): the vicissitudes of a "lingua minor"' in Otterspeer, W., ed., *Leiden Oriental Connections 1850–1940*. Leiden: 43–61.
- Jastrzebowska, E. 2001. 'Chersonèse dans l'Antiquité tardive: état des recherches et bibliographie', *AnTard* 9: 399–418.
- Jeffery, A. 1945. 'Three documents on the history of Christianity in south Arabia', *Anglican Theological Review* 27: 185–205.
- Jeffery, A. 1946. 'Christianity in Southern Arabia', *The Moslem World* 36: 204–16.
- Jeffreys, E., ed. 1990. *Studies in John Malalas*. Sydney.
- Jeffreys, E., ed., with Haldon, J., Cormack, R. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*. Oxford.
- Johnson, M. 1988. 'Toward a History of Theoderic's Building Program', *DOP* 42: 73–96.
- Jones, A.H.M. 1964. *The Later Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Jones, F.S. 1992. 'Evaluating the Latin and Syriac translations of the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions', *Apocrypha* 3: 237–57.
- Jones Hall, L. 2004. *Roman Berytus. Beirut in Late Antiquity*. London.
- Jordan, H. 1871. *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*, vol.2. Berlin.
- Jugié, M. 1925. 'Julien d'Halicarnasse et Sévère d'Antioche', *Echos d'Orient* 24: 129–62, 257–85.
- Jühlicher, A. 1899. Review of AK, *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen* 161: 719–23.

- Kaegi, W. 1965. 'Arianism and the Byzantine army in Africa, 533–546', *Traditio* 21: 23–53.
- Kaegi, W. 1991. 'Challenges to Late Roman and Byzantine Military Operations in Iraq (4th–9th centuries)', *Klio* 73: 586–94.
- Kaldellis, A. 2002. *Lesbos kai anatoliki mesogeios kata ti romaiki kai proimi byzantini periodo (100 p.Kh. – 600 p.Kh.) (Lesbos and the Eastern Mediterranean in the Roman and Early Byzantine Period)*. Thessaloniki.
- Kaldellis, A. 2004. *Procopius of Caesarea. Tyranny, philosophy and history at the end of antiquity*. Philadelphia.
- Kannengiesser, C. and Stein, M., 2001. 'Julianus von Halikarnassos', *RAC* 19: 505–8.
- Karalewsky, C. 1914. 'Amid', *DHGE* 2: 1237–49.
- Karlin-Hayter, P. 1995. 'A note on bishops, saints, and proximity to Constantinople' in C. Mango and G. Dagron, eds, *Constantinople and its Hinterland*: 397–410. Aldershot.
- Kelly, C. 2004. *Administering the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, MA.
- Keppie, L. 1984. *The Making of the Roman Army*. London.
- Kessler, H.L. and Wolf, G., eds. 1998. *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation*. Bologna.
- Kettenhofen, E. 1995. *Tirdād und die Inschrift von Paikuli. Kritik der Quellen zur Geschichte Armeniens im späten 3. und frühen 4. Jh. n. Chr.* Wiesbaden.
- Kettenhofen, E. 1996. 'Deportations, ii. Parthian and Sasanian periods', *EI* vii: 297–308.
- Key Fowden, E. 1999. *The Barbarian Plain*. Princeton.
- Keys, D. 1999. *Catastrophe. An investigation into the origins of the modern world*. New York.
- Khurshudian, E. 1998. *Die Parthischen und Sasanidischen Verwaltungsinstitutionen: nach den literarischen und epigraphischen Quellen*. Yerevan.
- Kiraz, G., ed. 2008. *Malphono w-Rabo d-Malphone. Studies in Honor of Sebastian P. Brock*. Piscataway.
- Kislinger, E. and Stathakopoulos, D. 1999. 'Pest und Perserkriege bei Prokop. Chronologische Überlegungen zum Geschehen, 540–545', *Byz* 69: 76–98.
- Kitzinger, E. 1954. 'The cult of images before Iconoclasm', *DOP* 8: 83–150.
- Klauck, H.-J., tr. McNeil, B. 2003. *Apocryphal Gospels. An Introduction*. London.
- Kmoskó, M., ed. Felföldi, S., Zimonyi, I. 2004. *Szír Irók a Steppe Népeiről*. Budapest.
- Koder, J. 1996. 'Climate change in the fifth and sixth centuries' in Allen and Jeffreys, eds: 270–85.
- Kofsky, A. 'Peter the Iberian. Pilgrimage, Monasticism and Ecclesiastical Politics in Byzantine Palestine', *Liber Annuus* 47: 209–22.
- Kohlhas-Müller, D. 1995. *Untersuchungen zur Rechtsstellung Theoderichs des Großen*. Frankfurt.
- König, I. 1997. *Aus der Zeit Theoderichs des Großen*. Darmstadt.
- Kosiński, R. 2007. 'The Life of Nestorius as seen in Greek and Oriental sources' in Brodka and Stachura, eds: 155–70.

- Kraemer, R.S. 1998. *When Aseneth met Joseph. A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife*. Oxford.
- Kralidis, A.F. 2003. *The Khazars and Byzantium* (in Greek). Athens.
- Krautheimer, R. 1980. *Rome. Profile of a City, 312–1308*. Princeton.
- Kronk, G.W. 1999. *Cometography. A Catalog of Comets*, vol.1, *Ancient-1799*. Cambridge.
- Krüger, G. 1884. *Monophysitische Streitigkeiten im Zusammenhange mit der Reichspolitik*. Jena.
- Krüger, G. 1901. Review of AK and HB, *BZ* 10: 283–7.
- Krüger, G. 1906. 'Bischof Severus', *Reallexikon für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 18: 250–6.
- Krüger, G. 1908. 'Zacharias Scholastikus', *Reallexikon für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 21: 593–8.
- Krüger, P. 1938. 'Das syrisch-monophysitische Mönchtum im Tur-Ab(h)din von seinen Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts', *OCP* 4: 5–46.
- Kugener, M.-A. 1900a. 'Observations sur la Vie de l'ascète Isaïe et sur les Vies de Pierre l'Ibérien et de Théodore d'Antinoé par Zacharie le Scholastique', *BZ* 9: 464–70.
- Kugener, M.-A. 1900b. 'La compilation historique de Pseudo-Zacharie le Rhéteur', *ROC* 5: 201–14, 461–80.
- Kugener, M.-A. 1900c. 'Remarques sur les traductions des formules grecques: *ho tês eusebous* et *ho tês hosias mnêmês*', *ROC* 5: 155–60.
- Kugener, M.-A. 1904. 'Sévère, patriarche d'Antioche, 512–518. Textes syriaques publiés, traduits et annotés', *PO* 2: 205–400. (See also Joh. V. Sev. under primary sources above).
- Kuhrt, A. 1995. *The Ancient Near East, c.3000–330 B.C.*, 2 vols. London.
- Labourt, J. 1904. *Le christianisme dans la Perse sous la dynastie sassanide (224–632)*. Paris.
- Laga, C., Munitiz, J.A., van Rompay, L., eds. 1985. *After Chalcedon. Studies in theology and church history offered to Prof. Albert van Roey for his 70th birthday*. Louvain.
- Lampe, G.H.W. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford.
- Land, J.P.N. 1870. See under Pseudo-Zachariah, *Historia ecclesiastica* above.
- Land, J.P.N. 1887. 'Aardrijkskundige fragmenten uit de syrische literatuur der zesde en zevende eeuw', *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, III.3. Amsterdam: 164–93.
- Lane Fox, R. 1997. 'The Life of Daniel the Stylite' in Edwards, M. and Swain, S., eds, *Portraits. Biography and Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: 175–225.
- Lang, D.M. 1951. 'Peter the Iberian and his Biographers', *JEH* 2: 156–68.
- Lang, D.M. 1983. 'Iran, Armenia and Georgia' in Yarshater, E., ed. 505–36.
- Lange, C. 2010. "'From that moment Rome, even like the Church, was rent in twain" – Syriac Chronographers on the End of the Western Empire', *StPat* 45: 235–44.

- Lange, C. Forthcoming in *Festschrift für Ernst Ludwig Grasmück*. 'Ferner führte zu seiner Zeit ein gewisse Tyrann Theoderich – Einige Anmerkungen zur Theoderich-Überlieferung in syrischen Geschichtswerken'.
- Lebon, J. 1908. 'La christologie de Timothée Aelure, archévêque monophysite d'Alexandrie, d'après les sources syriaques inédites', *RHE* 9: 677–702.
- Lebon, J. 1909. *Le monophysisme séverien*. Louvain.
- Lebon, J. 1914. 'Ephrem d'Amid, patriarche d'Antioche (526–544)' in *Mélanges d'Histoire offerts à Ch. Moeller*, vol.1. Paris: 197–214.
- Lebon, J. 1927. 'Version arménienne et version syriaque de Timothée Élure', *Handes Amsorya* 41: 713–22.
- Lebon, J. 1930. 'Textes inédits de Philoxène de Mabboug', *Muséon* 43: 17–84, 149–220.
- Lebon, J. 1946. 'Autour du cas de Dioscore d'Alexandrie', *Muséon* 59: 515–28.
- Lebon, J. 1951. 'La christologie du monophysisme syrien' in Grillmeier and Bacht: 425–580.
- Lee, A.D. 1993. 'Evagrius, Paul of Nisibis and the Problem of Loyalties in the Mid-Sixth Century', *JEH* 44: 569–85.
- Lenski, N. 1999. 'Assimilation and revolt in the territory of Isauria, from the 1st century B.C. to the 6th century A.D.', *JESHO* 42 (1999), 413–65.
- Lenski, N. 2007. 'Two Sieges of Amida (AD 359 and 502–503) and the Experience of Combat in the Late Roman Near East' in Lewin and Pellegrini, eds: 219–36.
- Leone, A. 2007. *Changing Townscapes in North Africa from Late Antiquity to the Arab Conquest*. Bari.
- Lepelley, C. 1979–81. *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au bas-empire*, 2 vols. Paris.
- Leppin, H. 2003. 'The Church Historians (I): Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoretus' in Marasco, ed.: 219–54.
- Leppin, H. 2007. 'Zu den Anfängen der Kirchenpolitik Justinians' in Wiemer, ed.: 187–208.
- Levenq, G. 1935. 'Beth Arsam', *DHGE* 8: 1228.
- Levison, W. 1924. 'Konstantinische Schenkung und Silvester-Legende', in *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle. Scritti di storia e paleografia*, vol.2: 159–247.
- Lewin, A. and Pellegrini, P. 2007, eds. *The Late Roman Army in the Near East from Diocletian to the Arab Conquest*. Oxford.
- Lewis Smith, A. 1910. *The Old Syriac Gospels*. London.
- L'Huillier, P. 1996. *The Church of the Ancient Councils. The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*. Crestwood.
- Liebeschuetz, W. 1993. 'Ecclesiastical Historians on their own Times', *StPat* 24: 151–63.
- Liebeschuetz, W. 2001. 'Berytus' in *RAC Suppl. 1*: 1027–42.
- Lietzmann, H. 1904. *Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule*. Tübingen.
- Lieu, S.N.C. 1986. 'Captives, Refugees and Exiles: a study of cross-frontier civil movements and contacts between Rome and Persia from Valerian to Jovian' in Freeman and Kennedy, eds.: 475–505.

- Lieu, S.N.C. 1992. *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China*, 2nd ed. Tübingen.
- Lieu, S.N.C. 1994. 'An early Byzantine Formula for the renunciation of Manichaeism – The *Capita VII Contra Manichaeos* of <Zacharias of Mitylene>. Introduction, text, translation and commentary' in idem, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*. Leiden: 203–305. [Originally published in shorter form in *JAC* 26 (1983): 152–218].
- Lieu, S.N.C. 2006. 'Constantine in legendary literature' in N. Lenski, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*. Cambridge: 298–321.
- Lilie, R.-J. 1995. 'Die Krönung des Kaisers Anastasios I. (491)', *BSI* 56: 3–12.
- Lillington-Martin, C. 2007. 'Archaeological and Ancient Literary Evidence for a Battle near Dara Gap, Turkey, AD 530: Topography, Texts and Trenches' in Lewin and Pellegrini, eds: 299–311.
- Lim, R. 1995. *Public Disputation, Power and Social Order in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Linder, A. 1976. 'Ecclesia and Synagoga in the medieval myth of Constantine the Great', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 52:2: 1019–60.
- Lippold, A. 1972. 'Zenon 17', *RE* 2.X A: 149–213.
- Lippold, A. 1974. 'Hephthalitai', *RE Supp.* xiv: 127–37.
- Little, L.K., ed. 2007. *Plague and the end of antiquity. The pandemic of 541–750*. Cambridge.
- Littmann, E. 1922. 'Zur Topographie der Antiochene und Apamene', *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 1: 163–95.
- Litvinsky, B.A., 1996. 'The Hephthalite empire' in Litvinsky, B.A., ed., *History of civilization in Central Asia*, vol.3, *The crossroad of civilizations, A.D. 250–750*. Paris: 135–62.
- Loenertz, R.J. 1975. 'Actus Silvestri. Genèse d'une légende', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 70: 426–39.
- Lounghis, T., Blysidu, B., Lampakes, St. 2005. *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 476 bis 565*. Nicosia.
- Louth, A. 'Why did the Syrians reject the council of Chalcedon' in Price and Whitby, eds: 107–16.
- Luther, A. 1997. *Die syrische Chronik des Josua Stylites*. Berlin.
- MacAdam, H.I. 2001–2. 'Studia et circenses: Beirut's Roman law school in its colonial, cultural context', *Aram* 13–14: 193–226.
- McCormick, M. 1986. *Eternal Victory*. Cambridge.
- MacGeorge, P. 2002. *Late Roman Warlords*. Oxford.
- McGuckin, J.A. 1994. *St. Cyril of Alexandria. The Christological Controversy. Its History, Theology and Texts*, Leiden. (Reissued in 2006, Crestwood).
- McGuckin, J.A. 1995. *St Cyril on the Unity of Christ*. Crestwood.
- McKenzie, J. 2007. *The Architecture of Alexandria and Egypt, c.300 B.C. to A.D. 700*. New Haven.
- McLeod, F.G. 1999. *The Image of God in the Antiochene Tradition*. Washington, D.C.

- McLeod, F.G. 2005. *The Roles of Christ's Humanity in Salvation: Insights from Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington, D.C.
- McLeod, F.G. 2009. *Theodore of Mopsuestia*. London.
- MacMullen, R. 2006. *Voting about God in early church councils*. New Haven.
- McVey, K. 1993. *George, bishop of the Arabs. A homily on blessed Mar Severus, Patriarch of Antioch*, CSCO Scr. Syr. 216–17. Louvain.
- Maas, M., ed. 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Justinian*. Cambridge.
- Maas, P. 1906. 'Die Chronologie der Hymnen des Romanus', *BZ* 15: 1–44.
- Maenchen-Helfen, O.J. 1973. *The World of the Huns*. Berkeley.
- Magdalino, P. 1993. 'The history of the future and its uses: prophecy, policy and propaganda' in Beaton, R. and Roueché, C., eds, *The Making of Byzantine History. Studies dedicated to Donald M. Nicol*. Aldershot: 3–34.
- Mahé, J.-P., and Aleksidzé, Z. 1997. 'Découverte d'un texte albanien: une langue ancienne du Caucase retrouvée', *CRAI*: 517–32.
- Mai, A. 1833. *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita*, vol.7. Rome.
- Mai, A. 1838. *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus edita*, vol.10. Rome.
- Mango, C.A. 1959. *The Brazen House*. Copenhagen.
- Mango, C.A. 1990. See Niceph. *Short History* under primary sources above.
- Mango, C.A. 1993. *Studies on Constantinople*. Aldershot.
- Mango, C.A. and Scott, R. 1996. See Theophanes under primary sources.
- Mango, C.A. and Ševčenko, I. 1972. 'Three inscriptions of the reigns of Anastasius I and Constantine V', *BZ* 65: 379–93.
- Mansi, J.D. 1901. See under primary sources.
- Marasco, G., ed. 2003. *Greek and Roman Historiography in Late Antiquity. Fourth to Sixth Century A.D.* Leiden.
- Maraval, P. 1998a. 'Le concile de Chalcédoine' in Pietri, ed.: 78–106.
- Maraval, P. 1998b. 'La réception de Chalcédoine dans l'empire d'orient' in Pietri, ed.: 107–46.
- Maraval, P. 1998c. 'La politique religieuse de Justinien' in Pietri, ed.: 389–426.
- Maraval, P. 1998d. 'L'échec en orient: le développement des églises dissidentes dans l'empire' in Pietri, ed.: 457–81.
- Maraval, P. 1999. *L'empereur Justinien*. Paris.
- Markus, R. 1975. 'Church History and Early Historians', in Baker, D., ed., *Studies in Church History* 11, *The Materials, Sources and Methods of Ecclesiastical History*. Oxford: 1–17.
- Markwart, J. 1924. 'Ein arabischer Bericht über die arktischen (uralischen) Länder aus dem 10. Jahrhundert', *Ungarische Jahrbücher* 4: 262–334.
- Marquart, J. 1901. *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenaci in Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F. 3.2.
- Marquart, J. 1903. *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*. Leipzig.

- Martin, I. 1958. 'Die Revelatio s. Stephani und Verwandtes', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77: 419–33.
- Martin, P. 1876. 'Lettres de Jacques de Saroug aux moines du couvent de Mar Bassus, et à Paul d'Édesse, relevées et traduites', *ZDMG* 30: 217–75.
- Martin, A. 1984. 'Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandrie. Essai de topographie religieuse (IIIe-IVe siècles)', *Revue des études augustinienes* 30: 211–25.
- Martin, T.O. 1953. 'The Twenty-Eighth Canon of Chalcedon: A Background Note' in Grillmeier and Bacht, eds, vol. 2: 433–58.
- Maspero, J. 1912. *Organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine*. Paris.
- Maspero, J. 1923. *Histoires des patriarches d'Égypte*. Paris.
- Matthews, J.F. 1975. *Western aristocracies and imperial court, 364–425*. Oxford.
- Matthews, J.F. 1989. *The Roman Empire of Ammianus Marcellinus*. London.
- Meier, M. 2002. 'Zur Neukonzeption chronologisch-eschatologischer Modelle im oströmischen Reich des 6 Jh. n. Chr.' in W. Geerlings, ed., *Der Kalender. Aspekte einer Geschichte*. Paderborn: 151–81.
- Meier, M. 2003a. *Das andere Zeitalter Justinians*. Göttingen.
- Meier, M. 2003b. 'Die Inszenierung einer Katastrophe: Justinian und der Nika Aufstand', *ZPE* 142: 273–300.
- Meier, M. 2003c. 'Die Translatio des Christusbildes von Kamulianai und der Kreuzreliquie von Apameia nach Konstantinopel unter Justin II.', *ZAC* 7: 237–50.
- Meier, M. 2004a. 'Zur Funktion der Theodora-Rede im Geschichtswerk Prokops (BP 1,24,33–37)', *RhM* 147: 88–104.
- Meier, M. 2004b. *Justinian. Herrschaft, Reich und Religion*. Munich.
- Meier, M. 2007. 'Σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς – Der Aufstand gegen Anastasius im Jahr 512', *Millennium* 4: 157–237.
- Meier, M. 2009. *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*. Stuttgart.
- Menze, V. 2006. 'The *Regula ad Diaconos*: John of Tella, His Eucharistic Ecclesiology and the Establishment of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in Exile', *OrChr* 90: 44–90.
- Menze, V. 2008a. *Justinian and the Making of the Syriac Orthodox Church*. Oxford.
- Menze, V. 2008b. 'Jacob of Sarug, John of Tella and Paul of Edessa: ecclesiastical politics in Osrhoene, 519–522' in Kiraz, ed.: 421–38.
- Menze, V. 2008c. 'Johannes von Ephesus und Kaiser Justinian: ein Missionar, sein Patron und eine Heidenmission im Kleinasien des 6. Jahrhunderts' in *Asia Minor Studien* 65. *Vom Euphrat bis zum Bosphorus*. Bonn: 451–60.
- Menze, V., and Akalın, K. 2009. *John of Tella's Profession of Faith. The Legacy of a Sixth-Century Syrian Orthodox Bishop*. Piscataway.
- Meyendorff, J. 1989. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions. The Church, 450–680 A.D.* Crestwood.
- Michelson, D. 2008. "'Though he cannot be eaten, we consume him'. Appeals to liturgical practice in the christological polemic of Philoxenus of Mabbug' in Kiraz, ed.: 439–76.

- Millar, F. 2005. 'The Theodosian Empire (408–450) and the Arabs: Saracens or Ishmaelites' in Gruen, E., ed., *Cultural Borrowing and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*. Stuttgart: 297–315.
- Millar, F. 2006. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408–450)*. Berkeley.
- Millar, F. 2008. 'Constantinople and the Near Eastern Church under Justinian: Two Synods of C.E. 536', *JRS* 98: 62–82.
- Millar, F. 2009. 'The Syriac acts of the second Council of Ephesus (449)' in Price and Whitby, eds: 45–69.
- Minniti Colonna, M. 1973. See Zach. *De opif. Mundi* under primary sources above.
- Miquel, A. 1975. *La géographie humaine du monde musulman jusqu'au milieu du 11^e siècle. Géographie arabe et représentation du monde: la terre et l'étranger*. Paris.
- Mitchell, S. and Greatrex, G., eds. 2000. *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*. London.
- Mitchell, S. 2007. *A History of the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Mitchell, T.C. 1988. 'Israel and Judah from the coming of Assyrian domination until the fall of Samaria, and the struggle for independence in Judah (750–700 B.C.)', *CAH* iii.2, 2nd ed., ed. Boardman, J., et al. Cambridge: 322–70.
- Miyakawa, H. and Kollautz, A. 1968. 'Abdelai', *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik* 1: 88–126.
- Modéran, Y. 1998. 'L'Afrique et la persécution vandale' in Pietri, ed.: 247–78.
- Modéran, Y. 2003a. *Les Maures et l'Afrique romaine (IV^e – VII^e siècle)*. Rome.
- Modéran, Y. 2003b. 'Une guerre de religion: les deux Eglises d'Afrique à l'époque vandale', *AnTard* 11: 21–44.
- Moeller, C. 1944–5. 'Un représentant de la christologie néo-chalcédonienne au début du sixième siècle en Orient: Néphalius d'Alexandrie', *RHE* 40: 73–140.
- Moeller, C. 1953. Review of Honigsmann 1953a, *RHE* 48: 262–73.
- Moeller, C. 1956. Review of Hespel 1955, *RHE* 51: 550–4.
- Moeller, C. 1961. 'Un fragment du Type de l'empereur Anastase I', *StPat* 3: 240–7.
- Moloney, F.J. 1998. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, MN.
- Moorhead, J. 1992. *Theoderic in Italy*. Oxford.
- Moorhead, J. 1994. *Justinian*. London.
- Moorhead, J. 2001. *The Roman Empire Divided*. London.
- Moravcsik, G. 1958. *Byzantinoturcica*, 2nd ed., vol.2. Berlin.
- Morony, M. 1984. *Iraq after the Muslim Conquest*. Princeton.
- Morony, M. 2004. 'Population transfers between Sasanian Iran and the Byzantine empire' in *La Persia e Bisanzio. Atti dei Convegni Lincei* 201. Rome: 161–79.
- Morony, M. 2007. "'For Whom does the Writer Write?'" The First Bubonic Plague Pandemic According to Syriac Sources', in Little, ed.: 59–86.
- Morrisson, C. 1989. 'Monnaie et prix à Byzance du Ve au VII^e siècle' in *Hommes et Richesses*, vol.1: 239–60.
- Morrisson, C., ed. 2004a. *Le monde byzantin*, vol.1, *L'empire romain d'Orient (330–641)*. Paris.

- Morrisson, C. 2004b. 'Les événements/perspective chronologique' in Morisson, ed.: 1–47.
- Mosshammer, A. 1979. *The Chronicle of Eusebius and Greek Chronographic Tradition*. Lewisburg.
- Mosshammer, A. 2008. *The Easter Computus and the Origins of the Christian Era*. Oxford.
- Motta, D. 2003. 'L'imperatore Anastasio: tra storiografia ed agiografia', *Mediterraneo Antico* 6: 195–234.
- Mouterde, P. 1932. 'Les versions syriaques du tome de saint Léon', *MUSJ* 16: 119–65.
- Mouterde, P. 1951. 'Le concile de Chalcédoine d'après les historiens monophysites de langue syriaque' in Grillmeier and Bacht, vol.1: 581–602.
- Müller, W.W. 1991. 'Himyar', *RAC* 15: 303–31.
- Mundell [Mango], M. 1975. 'A Sixth Century Funerary Relief at Dara in Mesopotamia', *JÖB* 24: 209–27.
- Mundell [Mango], M. 1977. 'Monophysite church decoration' in Bryer, A., and Herrin, J., eds, *Iconoclasm*. Birmingham: 59–74.
- Mundell Mango, M. 1981. 'The sixth century sculpture of the monastery of Deir Za'Faran, *Actes du XVe congrès international d'études byzantines*, vol.II.B. Athens: 511–28.
- Mundell Mango, M. 1982. 'Patrons and Scribes in Syriac manuscripts, 411 to 800 A.D.', *JÖB* 32.4: 3–12.
- Mundell Mango, M. 1983. 'Where was Beth Zagbe?', *Okeanos = Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7: 405–30.
- Murray, R. 2004. *Symbols of Church and Kingdom*, 2nd ed. London and Piscataway, NJ.
- Nagel, P. 1990. 'Grundzüge syrischer Geschichtschreibung' in Winkelmann, F. and Brandes, W., eds, *Quellen zur Geschichte des frühen Byzanz (4.-9. Jahrhundert): Bestand und Probleme*. Berlin: 245–59.
- Nau, F. 1897. 'Note sur l'époque à laquelle écrivait l'historien Zacharie de Mitylène', *JA* 9.9: 527–531.
- Nau, F. 1899. Review of AK, *Bulletin Critique* 20: 589–93.
- Nau, F. 1900a. Review of AK and HB, *ROC* 5: 327–8.
- Nau, F. 1900b. Review of HB, *Bulletin Critique* 21: 241–7.
- Nau, F. 1902a. 'Histoire de Jean bar Aphthonia', *ROC* 7: 97–135.
- Nau, F. 1902b. *Les récits inédits du moine Anastase*. Paris.
- Nau, F. 1909a. 'Littérature canonique syriaque inédite', *ROC* 14: 1–49, 113–30.
- Nau, F. 1909b. 'Sur la christologie de Timothée Aelure', *ROC* 14: 99–103.
- Nau, F. 1910. 'La lettre de Nestorius aux habitants de Constantinople' (ed. Brooks, E.W.), *ROC* 15: 275–81.
- Nau, F. 1913–15/17. 'Résumé de monographies syriaques', *ROC* 18: 272–6, 379–89, 19: 113–34, 278–89, 414–40, 20: 3–32.
- Neil, B. 2009. *Leo the Great*. Abingdon.

- Nestle, E. 1895. 'Die Kreuzauffindunglegende nach einer Handschrift vom Sinai', *BZ* 4: 318–45.
- Neugebauer, O., and van Hoesen, H.B. 1959. *Greek Horoscopes*. Philadelphia.
- Noethlichs, K.L. 2001. 'Justinianus I', *RAC* 19: 668–763.
- Noethlichs, K.L. 2007. 'Jews, heretics or useful farm workers? Samaritans in late antique imperial legislation' in Drinkwater and Salway, eds: 57–65.
- Nöldeke, T. 1871. Review of Land 1870, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*: 1–4.
- Nöldeke, T. 1879. See Tabari under primary sources above.
- Nöldeke, T. 1890. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alexanderromans in Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Phil.-hist. Cl. 38. Vienna.
- Nöldeke, T. 1899. Review of AK, *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland*: 1362–4.
- Nöldeke, T. 1902. Review of Marquart 1901, *ZDMG* 56: 427–36.
- Nordh, A. 1949. See *Libellus de regionibus urbis Romae* under primary sources.
- Norton, P. 2007. *Episcopal Elections, 250–600. Hierarchy and Popular Will in Late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Olivieri, A., et al. 1898. *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum*, vol.1, *Codices Florentini*. Brussels.
- Orlandi, T. 1975. See *V. Long*. above under primary sources.
- Ortiz de Urbina, I. 1965. *Patrologia Syriaca*, 2nd ed. Rome.
- Overbeck, J.J. 1865. *S. Ephraemi Syri, Rabulae episcopi Edesseni, Balaei aliorumque opera selecta*. Oxford.
- Palmer, A. 1990. *Monk and Mason on the Tigris Frontier*. Cambridge.
- Palmer, A. 1993 (with Brock, S. and Hoyland, R.). *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*. Liverpool. (See also above, under primary sources, *Chr.* 724, *Chr.* 1234).
- Palmer, A. 1988, with Rodley, L. 'The inauguration of Hagia Sophia in Edessa: a new edition and translation with historical and architectural notes and a comparison with a contemporary Constantinopolitan kontakion', *BMGS* 12: 117–67.
- Pani Ermini, L. 1999. 'Roma da Alarico a Teoderico' in Harris, ed.: 35–52.
- Parkes, J. 1934. *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*. London.
- Pásztori-Kupán, I. 2006. *Theodoret of Cyrus*. London.
- Patlagean, E. 1977. *Pauvreté économique et pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e - 7e siècles*. Paris.
- Payne Smith, J. 1903. *A compendious Syriac dictionary*. Oxford.
- Peeters, P. 1910. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Orientalis*. Brussels.
- Peeters, P. 1923. 'Le texte original de la passion des sept dormants', *AnBoll* 41: 369–85.
- Peeters, P. 1926. 'La passion arabe de S. 'Abd al-Masih', *AnBoll* 44: 270–341.
- Peeters, P. 1944. Review of M. Brière, *Les Homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, *AnBoll* 62: 257–60.
- Peeters, P. 1948. 'Jacques de Saroug, appartient-il à la secte monophysite?', *AnBoll*

- 66: 134–98.
- Peeters, P. 1950. *Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*, Subsidia Hagiographica 26. Brussels.
- Peeters, P. 1951. 'Hypatius et Vitalien: autour de la succession de l'empereur Anastase' in idem, *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientales*. Brussels: 233–75. Also in *Annuaire de l'institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves* 10, 1950 (*Mélanges H. Grégoire*): 5–51.
- Perrone, L. 1980. *La chiesa di Palestina e le controversie cristologiche*. Brescia.
- Perrone, L. 1996. 'The Impact of the Dogma of Chalcedon on Theological Thought' in Di Berardino, A., and Studer, B., eds, *History of Theology*, vol.1, *The Patristic Period*, tr. O'Connell, M.J. Collegeville: 414–60.
- Perrone, L. 2008. 'Pierre l'Ibère ou l'exil comme pèlerinage et combat pour la foi' in Blaudeau, ed.: 351–70.
- Perry, S.G.F. 1881. See *Acts Eph. II* under primary sources above.
- Petit, L. 1900. Review of AK, BZ 9: 527–30.
- Pietri, Ch. 1976. *Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son origine, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, 2 vols. Rome.
- Pietri, Ch. 1987. 'Jean Talaïa, émule d'Athanase', *ALEXANDRINA. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie, mélanges offerts à Claude Mondésert*. Paris: 277–95 (= Pietri 1997: 589–607).
- Pietri, Ch. 1995. 'De la *partitio* de l'Empire chrétien à l'unité sous Constance: la querelle arienne et le premier césaropapisme' in Pietri and Pietri, eds: 289–335.
- Pietri, Ch. 1997. *Christiana Respublica. Éléments d'une enquête sur le christianisme antique*, 3 vols. Paris.
- Pietri, Ch. and Pietri, L., eds. 1995. *Histoire du Christianisme*, vol.2, *Naissance d'une chrétienté (240–430)*. Paris.
- Pietri, L. 1998, ed. *Histoire du Christianisme*, vol.3. *Les églises d'orient et d'occident*. Paris.
- Pigulevskaya, N. 1952. 'Imja «Rus» v sirijskom istochnike VI v.', *Akademiku Borisu Dmitrievichu Grekovu ko dniu semidesiatiletia: sbornik statei*, 42–8. Moscow.
- Pigulevskaya, N. 1969. 'Note sur les relations de Byzance et des Huns au VIe s.', *Revue des études sud-est européennes* 7: 199–203.
- Pitra, J.-B. 1883. *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi*, vol.4. Paris.
- Pognon, H. 1907. *Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie, et de la région de Mossoul*. Paris.
- Poggi, V. 1986. 'Severo di Antiochia alla Scuola di Beirut' in Pavan, M., and Cozzoli, U., eds, *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*. Rome: 57–71.
- Pohlkamp, W. 1992. 'Textfassungen, literarische Formen und geschichtliche Funktionen der römischen Silvester-Akten', *Francia* 19: 115–96.
- Poulter, A.G., ed. 2007. *The Transition to Late Antiquity on the Danube and Beyond*, *ProcBrAc* 141.
- Pourshariati, P. 2008. *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire. The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran*. London.

- Price, R. 2009a. 'The Council of Chalcedon (451): a narrative' in Price and Whitby, eds: 70–91.
- Price, R. 2009b. 'Truth, Omission, and Fiction in the Acts of Chalcedon' in Price and Whitby, eds.: 92–106.
- Price, R. 2009c. 'The Second Council of Constantinople (553) and the malleable past' in Price and Whitby, eds.: 117–32.
- Price, R. 2009d. *The Acts of Constantinople, 553*, 2 vols. Liverpool.
- Price, R. and Whitby, M., eds. 2009. *Chalcedon in Context. Church Councils, 400–700*. Liverpool.
- Pringle, D. 1981. *The Defence of Byzantine Africa from Justinian to the Arab Conquest*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- Prostko-Prostyński, J. 1993. 'Alimericus Anticaesar (Teodoryk Wielki) w *Historii Kościoła Pseudo-Zachariasza Retora*', *Academia Scientiarum et Litterarum Polona Institutum Historicum. Commentationes* 24: 15–28. Warsaw-Poznań.
- Prostko-Prostyński, J. 1994. *Utraque respublica. The Emperor Anastasius' Gothic Policy (491–518)*. Poznań.
- Pummer, R. 2002. *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism*. Tübingen.
- Pusey, P.E. 1868–77. Oxford. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli [opera]*, 7 vols. Oxford.
- Rabello, A.M. 1987. *Giustiniano, Ebrei e Samaritani*, 2 vols. Milan.
- Rammelt, C. 2008. *Ibas von Edessa: Rekonstruktion einer Biographie und dogmatischen Position zwischen den Fronten*. Berlin.
- Rance, P. 2007. 'The date of the military compendium of Syrianus Magister (formerly the sixth-century Anonymus Byzantinus)', *BZ* 100: 701–37.
- Rance, P. 2010. *The Roman Art of War in Late Antiquity: The Strategikon of the Emperor Maurice. A Translation with Commentary and Textual Studies*. Birmingham.
- Rapp, C. 2005. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Raven, S. 1993. *Roman Africa*, 3rd. ed. London.
- Redies, M. 1997. 'Die Usurpation des Basiliskos (475–476) im Kontext der aufsteigenden Monophysitischen Kirche', *AnTard* 5: 211–21.
- Reinink, G.J., Klugkist, A.C., eds. 1999. *After Bardaisan: Studies on continuity and change in Syriac Christianity in honour of Professor Han J.W. Drijvers*. Louvain.
- Réville, J. 1900. Review of AK, *Revue d'histoire des religions* 41: 412–13.
- Riad, E. 1988. *Studies in the Syriac Preface*. Uppsala.
- Richard, M. 1951. 'Les florilèges diphysites' in Grillmeier and Bacht, vol.1: 719–48.
- Richter-Benburg, L. 1990. 'Boktišu', *Elr* iv: 333–6.
- Rist, J. 1998. 'Zacharias Scholastikos', *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* 14: 303–7.
- Rist, J. 2002. 'Die sogenannte Kirchengeschichte des Zacharias Rhetor: Überlieferung, Inhalt und theologische Bedeutung' in M. Tamcke, ed., *Syriaca. Zur Geschichte, Theologie, Liturgie und Gegenwartslage der syrischen Kirchen*. Hamburg: 77–99.

- Rist, J. 2004. 'Der Bau der ostsyrischen Stadt Dārā (Anastasiupolis). Überlegungen zum Eigengut in der Kirchengeschichte des Ps.-Zacharias Rhetor', in Tamcke, M., ed., *Syriaca II. Beiträge zum 3. deutschen Syrologen-Symposium in Vierzehnheiligen 2002*. Münster: 243–66.
- Rist, J. 2005. 'Zacharias Rhetor als Biograph: Zu Überlieferung und Inhalt der *Vita Severi Antiocheni* (BHO 1060), der *Vita Isaiae* (BHO 550), under *Vita Petri Iberi* (CPG 7001)' in Tamcke, M., Heinz, A., eds, *Die Suryoye und ihre Umwelt. 4. deutsches Syrologen-Symposium in Trier 2004. Festgabe Wolfgang Hage zum 70. Geburtstag*. Münster: 333–51.
- Robin, C. 1996. 'Le royaume hujride, dit «royaume de Kinda», entre Himyar et Byzance', *CRAI*: 665–714.
- Robin, C. 2008. 'Les Arabes de Himyar, des "Romains" et des Perses (IIIe – VIe siècles de l'ère chrétienne)', *Semitica et Classica* 1: 167–202.
- Rochow, I. 1978. 'Zu einigen oppositionellen religiösen Strömungen' in Winkelmann, F., Köpstein, H., Ditten, H., Rochow, I., eds, *Byzanz im 7. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Herausbildung des Foedalismus*. Berlin: 225–88.
- Rosen, K. 1999. 'Justinus I', *RAC* 19: 763–78.
- Roux, R. 2003. 'Notes sur la fonction épiscopale selon Sévère d'Antioch' in V. Ruggieri and L. Pieralli, eds, *Eukosmia. Studi miscellanei per il 75. di Vincenzo Poggi*. Soveria Mannelli: 427–41.
- Rubin, Z. 1989. 'Byzantium and Southern Arabia' in French and Lightfoot, eds.: 383–420.
- Rubin, Z. 1995. 'The reforms of Khusro Anūshirwān' in Cameron, ed.: 227–97.
- Rucker, I. 1933. *Florilegium Edessenum anonymum (syriace ante 562)*, Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abt., Heft 5.
- Russell, N. 2000. *Cyril of Alexandria*. London.
- Russell, N. 2003. 'Apostolic Man' and 'Luminary of the Church': the enduring influence of Cyril' in Weinandy and Keating: 237–57.
- Ryssel, V. 1896. 'Syrische Quellen abendländischer Erzählungsstoffe, IV. Die Silvesterlegende', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 95 (1896): 21–54.
- Ste. Croix, G.E.M. de. 2006, ed. Whitby, M., Streeter, J. *Christian Persecution, Martyrdom, and Orthodoxy*. Oxford.
- Saitta, B. 1999. *La civiltas di Teoderico*. Rome.
- Salaville, S. 1919–20. 'L'affaire de l'hénotique ou le premier schisme byzantin au Ve siècle', *EO* 18: 255–65, 389–97, 20: 49–68, 415–33.
- Saliou, C. 2000. 'Gaza de 407 à 637' in Humbert, J.-B., *Gaza méditerranéenne. Histoire et archéologie*. Paris: 73–7.
- Saliou, C., ed. 2005. *Gaza dans l'Antiquité Tardive. Archéologie, rhétorique et histoire*. Salerno.
- Saliou, C. 2007a. 'Gaza dans l'Antiquité Tardive' in *Gaza à la croisée des civilisations*, vol.1, *Contexte archéologique et historique*. Geneva: 141–60.

- Saliou, C. 2007b. 'Le monachisme gaziste' in the same volume: 141–70.
- Samuel, V.E. 1977. *The Council of Chalcedon Re-examined*. Delhi.
- Sanspeur, J.-M. 1975–6. 'L'Arménie au temps de Peroz', *REArm* 11: 83–172.
- Sauget, J.-M. 1968. 'L'homélaire du Vatican syriaque 253. Essai de reconstruction', *Muséon* 81: 297–349.
- Savvides, A. 2003. *Oi Alanoi tou Kaukasou kai oi metanastaseuseis tous*. Athens.
- Schilbach, E. 1970. *Byzantinische Metrologie*. Munich.
- Schilling, A.M. 2008. *Die Anbetung der Magier und die Taufe der Sāsāniden. Zur Geistesgeschichte des iranischen Christentums in der Spätantike*. Louvain.
- Schippmann, K. 1990. *Grundzüge der Geschichte des Sasanidischen Reiches*. Darmstadt.
- Schlange-Schöningen, H. 1995. *Kaisertum und Bildungswesen im spätantiken Konstantinopel*. Stuttgart.
- Schnelle, U. 1998. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Leipzig.
- Schnitzler, T. 1938. *Im Kampfe um Chalcedon. Geschichte und Inhalt des "Codex Encyclicus" von 458*. Rome.
- Schnitzler, T. 1953. 'Das Konzil von Chalkedon und die westliche (römische) Liturgie' in Grillmeier and Bacht, vol.2: 735–55.
- Schultess, F. 1905. *Christliche-Palästinische Fragmente aus der Omajjaden-Moschee zu Damaskus*, AbhGW Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl. NF VIII.3. Göttingen.
- Schwartz, E. 1927a. 'Die Kaiserin Pulcheria auf der Synode von Chalkedon' in *Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: 203–12.
- Schwartz, E. 1927b. See *Codex Vaticanus* under primary sources above.
- Schwartz, E. 1929. 'Der Prozess des Eutyches', *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, München*, Nr.5. Munich: 1–52.
- Schwartz, E. 1934. See *Publizistische Sammlungen* under primary sources above.
- Schwartz, E. 1939. See Cyr. Scyth. under primary sources above.
- Seeck, O. 1876. See *Notitia Dignitatum* under primary sources above.
- Seeck, O. 1919. *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 476 n. Chr. Vorarbeit zu einer Prosopographie der christlichen Kaiserzeit*, 2nd ed. Stuttgart.
- Segal, J.B. 1955. 'Mesopotamian communities from Julian to the rise of Islam', *ProcBrAc* 41: 109–39.
- Segal, J.B. 1970. *Edessa. The Blessed City*. Oxford.
- Shahbazi, S. 1987. 'Army: 5. The Sasanian Period', *Elr* ii: 496–9.
- Shahîd, I. 1964. 'Byzantino-Arabica: The Conference of Ramla, A.D. 524', *JNES* 23: 115–31.
- Shahîd, I. 1971. *The Martyrs of Najran. New Documents*. Washington, D.C.
- Shahîd, I. 1979. 'Byzantium in Southern Arabia', *DOP* 33: 23–94.
- Shahîd, I. 1994. 'On the chronology of the South Arabian martyrdoms', *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy* 5: 66–9.
- Shahîd, I. 1995. *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, I.1–2. Washington, D.C.
- Shahîd, I. 2002. *Byzantium and the Arabs in the Sixth Century*, II.1. Washington, D.C.
- Sherwood, P. 1952. 'Sergius of Reshaina and the Syriac versions of the Pseudo-

- Denis', *Sacris Erudiri* 4: 174–84.
- Sherwood, P. 1960–1. 'Mimro de Serge de Reshayna sur la vie spirituelle', *L'Orient syrien* 5: 433–57, 6: 95–115, 121–56.
- Sinor, D. 1946–7. 'Autour d'une migration d'un peuple au Ve s.', *JA* 235: 1–78.
- Sinor, D. 1990a. 'The Hun period', *CHEIA*: 177–205.
- Sinor, D. 1990b. 'The establishment and dissolution of the Türk empire' *CHEIA*: 285–316.
- Sivan, H. 2008. *Palestine in Late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Snively, C. 1999. 'Iustiniana Prima (Caričin Grad)', *RAC* 19: 638–68.
- Smith, A., ed. 2005. *The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honour of Peter Brown*. Swansea.
- Sodini, J.-P. and Biscop, J.-L. 1983. 'Travaux récent au sanctuaire de Saint Syméon (Qal'at Sem'an)', *CRAI*: 335–72.
- Sorabji, R. 2005. 'Divine names and sordid deals in Ammonius' Alexandria' in Smith, ed.: 203–13.
- Speigl, J. 1984. 'Das Religionsgespräch mit den severianischen Bischöfen in Konstantinopel im Jahre 532', *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 16: 264–85.
- Speigl, J. 1994. 'Die Synode von 536 in Konstantinopel', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 43: 105–53.
- Speigl, J. 1995. 'Formula Iustiniani. Kircheneinigung mit kaiserlichen Glaubensbekenntnissen (Codex Iustinianus I 1,5–8)', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 44: 105–34.
- Stathakopoulos, D. 2000. 'The Justinianic Plague Revisited', *BMGS* 24: 256–76.
- Stathakopoulos, D. 2004. *Famine and Pestilence in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine empire. A systematic survey of subsistence crises and epidemics*. Aldershot.
- Stein, E. 1944. 'Cyrille de Scythopolis. A propos de la nouvelle édition de ses œuvres', *AnBoll* 62: 169–86.
- Stein, E. 1949. *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol.2, ed. Palanque, J.-R. Paris-Brussels-Amsterdam.
- Stein, E. 1959. *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol.1, ed. Palanque, J.-R. Paris-Bruges.
- Steppa, J.-E. 2005. *John Rufus and the World Vision of anti-Chalcedonian Culture*, 2nd revised edition. Piscataway.
- Stevenson, J., rev. Frend, W.H.C. 1987. *A New Eusebius. Documents illustrating the history of the Church to A.D. 337*. London.
- Storey, G.R. 2002. 'Regionaries-Type Insulae 2: Architectural/Residential Units at Rome', *AJA* 102: 411–34.
- Stückelberger, A., and Grasshoff, G. 2006. See Ptolemy under primary sources.
- Stummer, F. 1954. 'Beschneidung', *RAC* 2: 159–69.
- Sundermann, W. 1989. 'Bidaxš', *Eir* iv: 242–4.
- Syvänne, I. 2004. 'The Age of Hippotoxotai', Ph.D. thesis. Tampere.
- Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. 1990. 'The Avars', *CHEIA*: 206–28.
- Taft, R. 1991. *A History of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom*, vol.4, *The diptychs*. Rome.
- Talbert, R.J. 2000. *The Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton.

- Tardieu, M. 1989. 'Chosroès' in Goulet, R., ed., *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, vol.2. Paris: 309–18.
- Tardy, R. 1999. *Najrân. Chrétiens d'Arabie avant l'islam*. Beirut.
- Telelis, I.G. 2004. *Meteorologika phainomena kai klima sto Byzantio*, 2 vols. Athens.
- ter Haar Romeny, B., ed. 2008. *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His Day*. Leiden.
- Thiel, A. 1867. *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, vol.1. Braunsberg.
- Thompson, E.A. 1946. 'Christian missionaries among the Huns', *Hermathena* 67: 73–9.
- Thompson, E.A., rev. Heather, P.J. 1996. *The Huns*. Oxford.
- Thurman, W.S. 1968. 'How Justinian I sought to handle the problem of religious dissent', *GOTR* 13: 15–40.
- Torrance, I. 1988. *Christology after Chalcedon: Severus of Antioch and Sergius the Monophysite*. Norwich.
- Toumanoff, C. 1963. *Studies in Christian Caucasian History*. Georgetown.
- Treadgold, W. 1997. *A History of the Byzantine State and Society*. Stanford.
- Treadgold, W. 2007. *The Early Byzantine Historians*. Basingstoke.
- Trombley, F.R. 1993–4. *Hellenic Religion and Christianization*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- Trombley, F.R. 1997. 'War and society in rural Syria, c.502–613 A.D.: some observations on the epigraphy', *BMGs* 21: 154–209.
- Tuillier, A. 1987. 'Remarques sur les fraudes des Apollinaristes et des Monophysites. Notes de critique textuelle' in Dummer, J., ed., *Texte und Textkritik. Eine Aufsatzsammlung*. Berlin: 581–90.
- Urbainczyk, T. 1997. *Socrates of Constantinople, Historian of Church and State*. Ann Arbor.
- Urbainczyk, T. 2002. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus. The Bishop and Holy Man*. Ann Arbor.
- Uthemann, K.-H. 1999. 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe', *Augustinianum* 39: 5–83.
- Uthemann, K.-H. 2001. 'Zur Rezeption des Tomus Leonis in und nach Chalkedon', *StPat* 34: 572–604 (= Uthemann 2005: 1–36).
- Uthemann, K.-H. 2005. *Christus, Kosmos, Diatribe. Themen der frühen Kirche als Beiträge zu einer historischen Theologie*. Berlin.
- Valentini, R. and Zucchetti, G. 1940. *Codice Topografico della Città di Roma*. Rome.
- van Bakkum, W., Drijvers, J.W., Klugkist, A.C., eds. 2007. *Syriac Polemics. Studies in Honour of Gerrit Jan Reinink*. Louvain.
- Van Dam, R. 1985. 'From paganism to Christianity in late antique Gaza', *Viator* 16: 1–20.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1986. 'Une lettre de Dorothée comte de Palestine à Marcel et Mari en 452', *AnBoll* 104: 145–59.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1987. 'Who is Mari, the addressee of Ibas' letter?', *JTS* 38: 129–35.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1990. 'Une note de Sévère d'Antioche sur Judas Cyriaque' in R. Lavenant, ed., *V Symposium Syriacum*. Rome: 183–93.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1992. 'Le manuscrit hébreu Paris 755 et l'histoire des martyrs de

- Nedjran' in Canivet, P., and Rey-Coquais, J.-P., *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam, VII-VIIIe s.* Damascus: 25–30.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1996. 'The Memra on the Parrot by Isaac of Antioch', *JTS* 47: 464–76.
- van Esbroeck, M. 1999/2000. 'Peter the Fuller and Cyrus of Edessa', *Aram* 12: 467–74.
- van Esbroeck, M. 2001. 'Albanien', *RAC* suppl.1: 257–66.
- van Ginkel, J. 1994. 'John of Ephesus on Emperors: the perception of the Byzantine empire by a Monophysite' in R. Lavenant, ed., *VI Symposium Syriacum*. Rome: 323–33.
- van Ginkel, J. 1995. *John of Ephesus. A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium*. Groningen.
- van Ginkel, J. 1998a. Review of Witakowski 1996a, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 53: 499–502.
- van Ginkel, J. 1998b. 'Making History: Michael the Syrian and his Sixth-Century Sources' in Lavenant, R., ed., *VII Symposium Syriacum 1996*. Rome: 351–8.
- van Ginkel, J. 2006. 'Michael the Syrian and his sources: Reflections on the methodology of Michael the Great as a historiographer and its implications for modern historians', *JCSSS* 6: 53–60.
- van Ginkel, J. 2007. 'The End is Near! Some Remarks on the Relationship between Historiography, Eschatology, and Apocalyptic Literature in the West-Syrian Tradition' in van Bakkum, Drijvers, Klugkist, eds: 205–17.
- van Ginkel, J. 2008. 'Greetings to a Virtuous Man. The Correspondence of Jacob of Edessa' in ter Haar Romeny, ed.: 67–81.
- van Nuffelen, P. 2004a. 'Socrate de Constantinople et les chroniques', *JÖB* 54: 53–75.
- van Nuffelen, P. 2004b. *Un héritage de paix et de piété. Étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*. Turnhout.
- van Oort, J. and Roldanus, J., eds. 1998. *Chalkedon: Geschichte und Aktualität*. Louvain.
- van Roey, A. 1964/7. 'Eutychès', *DHGE* 16: 87–91.
- van Rompay, L. 1982. 'The martyrs of Najran, some remarks on the nature of the sources' in Quaegebeur, J., ed., *Studia Paulo Naster Oblata*, vol.2. Louvain: 301–9.
- van Rompay, L. 1985. 'Proclus of Constantinople's "Tomus ad Armenios" in the post-Chalcedonian tradition' in Laga, Munitiz and van Rompay, eds.: 425–49.
- van Rompay, L. 2005. 'Society and Community in the Christian East' in Maas, ed.: 239–66.
- Vaschalde, A. 1902. *Three Letters of Philoxenus bishop of Mabbôgh (485–519)*. Rome.
- Vasiliev, A.A. 1950. *Justin I. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great*. Washington, D.C.
- Vööbus, A. 1958, 1960, 1988. *History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient: a contribution to the history of culture in the Near East*, 3 vols. CSCO Subs. 14, 17, 81. Louvain.

- Vööbus, A. 1962. 'Solution du problème de l'auteur de la «Lettre à Gemellinus, évêque de Perrhé»', *L'Orient syrien* 7: 297–306.
- Vööbus, A. 1970. *Syrische Kanonessammlungen. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde. I. Westsyrische Originalurkunden*, I.B., CSCO Subs.38. Louvain.
- Vööbus, A. 1975–6. *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition. Ecclesiastical Canons which were given by the Holy Fathers during the time of persecution*, 4 vols., CSCO 367–8, 375–6. Louvain.
- Vööbus, A. 1982. 'Entdeckung neuer Handschriften des antijulianischen Pastoralerschreibens', *OrChr* 66: 114–17.
- Walker, J. 2006. *The Legend of Mar Qardagh. Narrative and Christian Heroism in Late Antique Iraq*. Berkeley.
- Wallace-Hadrill, D.S. 1982. *Christian Antioch: a study of early Christian thought in the East*. Cambridge.
- Wallraff, M. 1997. *Die Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsschreibung, Methode und Person*. Göttingen.
- Ward-Berkins, B. 1984. *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. Oxford.
- Watt, J.W. 1999a. 'A portrait of John bar Aphthonia, founder of the monastery of Qenneshre' in Watt, J.W. and Drijvers, J.W., *Portraits of Spiritual Authority in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: 155–69.
- Watt, J.W. 1999b. 'Greek historiography and the "Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite"' in Reinink and Klugkist, eds: 317–27.
- Watts, E.J. 2005a. 'Winning the Intracommunal Dialogues: Zacharias Scholasticus' *Life of Severus*', *JECS* 13: 437–64.
- Watts, E.J. 2005b. 'An Alexandrian Christian response to fifth-century Neoplatonic influence' in Smith, ed.: 215–29.
- Watts, E.J. 2006. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Berkeley, CA.
- Watts, E.J. 2009a. 'Interpreting Catastrophe: Disasters in the Works of Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, Socrates Scholasticus, Philostorgius, and Timothy Aelurus', *JLA* 2: 79–98.
- Watts, E.J. 2009b. 'The Enduring Legacy of the Iatrosophist Gessius', *GRBS* 49: 113–33.
- Watts, E.J. 2010. *Riot in Alexandria*. Berkeley.
- Weber, G. 2000. *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*. Stuttgart.
- Wegenast, K. 1967. 'Zacharias Scholastikos', *RE* 9 A 2: 2212–16.
- Weinandy, T.G., and Keating, D.A. 2003. *The Theology of St Cyril of Alexandria. A critical appreciation*. London.
- Weltecke, D. 2003. *Die "Beschreibung der Zeiten" von Mor Michael dem Grossen (1126–1199)*, CSCO 594. Louvain.
- Wessel, S. 2004. *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian controversy: the making of a saint and of a heretic*. Oxford.
- Wessel, S. 2008. *Leo the Great and the Spiritual Rebuilding of a Universal Rome*. Leiden.

- Whitby, Michael. 1984. 'Procopius' description of Martyropolis', *Byzantinoslavica* 45: 177–82.
- Whitby, Michael. 1986a. 'Procopius and the development of defences in Roman Mesopotamia' in Freeman and Kennedy, eds.: 717–35.
- Whitby, Michael. 1986b. 'Procopius' description of Dara (*Buildings* II.1–3)', in Freeman and Kennedy, eds.: 737–83.
- Whitby, Michael. 1988. *The Emperor Maurice and his historian*. Oxford.
- Whitby, Michael. 1998. 'Deus nobiscum: Christianity, warfare, and morale in late antiquity' in M. Austin, J. Harries, C. Smith, eds, *Modus Operandi*. London: 191–208.
- Whitby, Michael. 2000a. See Evagr. under primary sources above.
- Whitby, Michael. 2000b. 'The successors of Justinian' in Cameron, Ward-Perkins and Whitby, eds: 86–111.
- Whitby, Michael. 2003. 'The Church historians and Chalcedon' in Marasco, ed.: 449–95.
- Whitby, Michael. 2005. Review of Kaldellis 2004, *CR* 55: 648–50.
- Whitby, Michael and Mary. 1989. See *Chr. Pasch.* above in primary sources.
- Whittow, M. 1990. 'Ruling the late Roman and Byzantine city', *Past and Present* 129: 3–29.
- Whittow, M. 1999. 'Rome and the Jafnids: Writing the History of a Sixth-Century Tribal Dynasty' in Humphrey, J., ed., *The Roman and Byzantine Near East*, vol.2. Portsmouth, RI: 207–24.
- Wickham, L. 1973. Review of Frend 1972, *JTS* 24: 591–9.
- Wickham, L. 1983. See Cyr. under primary sources above.
- Wickham, L. 2007. Review of Blaudeau 2006a, *JTS* 58: 729–32.
- Wiemer, H.-U., ed. 2007a. *Staatlichkeit und politisches Handeln in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin.
- Wiemer, H.-U. 2007b. 'Kaiser und Katastrophe. Zur Bewältigung von Versorgungskrisen im spätrömischen Reich' in Wiemer, ed.: 249–81.
- Wilks, M. 2008. 'Jacob of Edessa's Use of Greek Philosophy in His Hexaemeron' in ter Haar Romeny, ed.: 223–38.
- Winkermann, F. 1985. 'Konzeptionen des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat im frühen Byzanz, untersucht am Beispiel der Apostasia Palästinas (452–3)' in V. Vavřínek, ed., *From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium*. Prague: 73–85.
- Winkermann, F. 1994. *Die östlichen Kirchen in der Epoche der christologischen Auseinandersetzungen*, 4th ed. Leipzig.
- Winkler, G. 1994. See Koriwn under primary sources.
- Winkler, S. 1965. 'Die Samariter in den Jahren 529/30', *Klio* 43–5: 435–57.
- Wipszycka, E. 1994. 'Le monachisme égyptien et les villes', *TM* 12: 1–44, reprinted in Wipszycka 1996: 281–336.
- Wipszycka, E. 1996. *Études sur le christianisme dans l'Égypte de l'Antiquité tardive*. Rome.
- Witakowski, W. 1987. *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre*. Uppsala.

- Witakowski, W. 1990a. 'Malalas in Syriac' in Jeffreys, ed.: 299–310.
- Witakowski, W. 1990b. 'The idea of *septimana mundi* and the millennarian typology of the creation in Syriac tradition' in Lavenant, R., ed., *Symposium Syriacum V, 1988*. Rome: 93–109.
- Witakowski, W. 1991. 'Sources of Pseudo-Dionysius for the Third Part of his *Chronicle*', *OrSuec* 40: 252–75.
- Witakowski, W. 1993. 'Syrian Monophysite Propaganda in the Fifth to Seventh Centuries' in L. Rydén and J.O. Rosenqvist, eds, *Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium*. Uppsala: 57–66.
- Witakowski, W. 1996a. See Ps. Dion. above under primary sources.
- Witakowski, W. 1996b. 'The sources of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahrē for the second part of his *Chronicle*' in J.O. Rosenqvist, ed., *Leimon. Studies Presented to Lennart Rydén on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Uppsala: 181–210.
- Witakowski, W. 1999. 'Sources of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre for the Christian epoch of the first part of his *Chronicle*' in Reinink and Kister, eds: 329–66.
- Witakowski, W. 1999/2000. 'The *Chronicle* of Eusebius: its type and continuation in Syriac historiography', *Aram* 11–12: 419–37.
- Witakowski, W. 2007. 'Geographical knowledge of the Syrians' in Isaksson, B., Eskhult, M., Ramsay, G., eds, *The Professorship of Semitic Languages at Uppsala University. 400 Years: Jubilee volume from a Symposium held at the University Hall, 21–23 September 2005*: 219–46.
- Witakowski, W. 2008. 'The *Chronicle* of Jacob of Edessa' in ter Haar Romeny, ed.: 25–46.
- Witakowski, W. forthcoming. 'The *Miscellaneous History* of Pseudo-Zachariah of Mytilene'.
- Witek, F. 2001. 'Amazonen', *RAC suppl.* 1: 289–301.
- Wolfram, H., tr. Dunlap, T.J. 1988. *History of the Goths*. Berkeley.
- Wood, I.N. 1998. 'The barbarian invasions and first settlements' in Cameron et al. 1998: 516–37.
- Wood, P.J. 2007. 'Foundation myths in late antique Syria and Mesopotamia: the emergence of Miaphysite political thought, 400–600 A.D.', D. Phil. thesis. Oxford.
- Wright, W. 1870–2. *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols (in successive years). London.
- Wright, W. 1894. *A Short History of Syriac Literature*. London.
- Wright, W. 1901. *A Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts preserved in the Library of Cambridge*, 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Yarshater, E, ed. 1983. *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol.3 (two volumes). Cambridge.
- Yegül, F. 1982. *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity*. New York.
- Young, F.M. 1983. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon. A Guide to the Literature and its Background*. Philadelphia.
- Yousif, P. 1984. *L'eucharistie dans Saint Ephrem de Nisibe*, OCA 224. Rome.

- Zanini, E. 2003. 'The Urban Ideal and Urban Planning in Byzantine new cities of the sixth century A.D.' in Lavan, L. and Bowden, W., eds, *Theory and Practice in Late Antique archaeology*. Leiden: 196–223.
- Zehnecker, H. 1998. See Pliny, *HN* above under primary sources.
- Zuckerman, C. 2007. 'The Khazars and Byzantium – the First Encounter' in Golden et al., eds: 399–432.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL AND APOCRYPHAL CITATIONS

Reference is, as in the general index, to book, chapter and section.

Genesis		14.29	ix.16d
4.1–8	vi.5b	18.1	ix.16d
6.3 (Peshitta)	i.1a	28.15	xii.5a
11.1–4	i.1b	28.24–26	xii.5a
15.5–6	ix.13c		
16	xii.7f(xviii)	Joshua	
17.26–27	ix.13d	1.13–15	v.10a
18.27	ix.21a	4.12	v.10a*
21.22–24	ix.22a	22.9–1 (Peshitta)	i.1c
21.23	ix.22a	22.24–27 (Peshitta)	i.1c
21.31	ix.22a	22.31	ix.23a
22.2	ix.13d		
35.2–3	ix.20a	Judges	
41.45	i.6	8.24–27	i.1d
41.50	i.6	17.1–8	i.1e
46.20	i.6	1.3	ix.23a
Exodus		1 Samuel	
4.22	ix.13c	2.28–29	x.4f
14.3	ix.16a	2.30	x.4f
15.1	v.11b	11.1, 2	ix.23c
25.30	x.4c	14.24, 28	x.4f
		14.27	x.4f
		14.32	x.4f
Leviticus		17.48–50	v.11a
26.16 [Luke 12.17–20]	vii.3c, ix.20a	21.5–6	x.4c
Numbers		2 Samuel	
20.17 [Deut 2.27, Prov 4.27]	iv.12b	15	iii.2a
		18.18 (Peshitta)	i.1f
Deuteronomy			
2.27 [Num 20.17; Prov 4.27]	iv.12b		
8.3 [Matt 4.4, Luke 4.4]	x.4d		

1 Kings

9.18–19

viii.4a

2 Kings

6.24–33

vii.5c

8:17

ix.5a

17:24–41

ix.8a

Isaiah

1.22

vii.11c

6.6

x.4d

25.1

v.12a

26.1

ix.22d

26.20

viii.5f

36.6

iv.12dd

40.9

ix.21a

43.1–3

ix.20a

44.23 [49.13; Ps 95[96].11; Cyril

Alex. *ep.*39 (*CPG* 5339)?]

vi.6a

45.8

ix.24b

49.13 [44.23, Ps 95[96].11; Cyril

Alex. *ep.*39 (*CPG* 5339)?]

vi.6a

53.4 [Matt 8.17, 1 Pet 2.24]

ix.13a

60.4

v.12a

Jeremiah

1.9, 10

ix.24a

17.16

ix.26a

23.16

vii.11a

Ezekiel

3.17, 18

ix.25a

Amos

7.14 [LXX, Peshitta]

vi.5b

Habbakuk

2.1

ix.22d (twice)

3.11

ix.22c

Malachi

3.18

vii.11b

Psalms

21[22].7

ix.21a

22[23].23 (Peshitta) [Heb 2.12]

iii.1i

23[24].3

ix.21a

25[26].4

iii.1j

78[79].1 [Joh. Ruf. *Pler.* 16]

iii.5b

78[79].4

ix.23c

90[91].14–15

v.5c

95[96].11 [49.13, 44.23; Cyril Alex.

*ep.*39 (*CPG* 5339)?]

vi.6a

108[109].9 [1 Cor 15.27]

vi.6c

108[109].28

ix.22d

109[110].1

ix.15b, ix.15i

112[113].7

viii.1a

112[113].7–8

vi.5a

113[115].14, 15

v.12a

117[118].26 [Matt 21.9 and

elsewhere]

v.4c

118[119].53

ix.21a

120[121].4

ix.23c

125[126].2

v.12a

139[140].6

iv.12b

Proverbs

2.6–7 [LXX]

ix.13b

4.27 [Num 20.17, Deut 2.27]

iv.12b

8.9

ix.13e

10.11

viii.4a

10.14

ix.9a

16.13

ix.16d

18.3

iv.8a

20.8

ix.16c

20.26

ix.16c

21.1

vii.8a

22.10

vii.11b

Ecclesiastes

3.14

ix.22c

7.16–18

iv.12b

8.2

ix.16b

Job

Job 1–2

book 8 4d

526 THE CHRONICLE OF PSEUDO-ZACHARIAH RHETOR

18.8–10	ix.20a	22.13	v.11a
21.22 [Dan 2.21]	ix.13b	22.29	iv.6b
27.6	ix.23a	23.52	vii.12a
30.23	ix.16g	25.29	ix.16d
32.19 (Peshitta)	vii.7a	26.14, 25 [Mark 14.10,	
38.23	ix.22c	Luke 22.4, 48]	iii.2a
		26.26 [Mark 14.22, 1 Cor 11.25]	x.4d
Song of Songs		26.27	x.4d
5.2, 6.9	vii.11b	28.19	iv.6b
Daniel		Mark	
2.21 [Job 21.22]	ix.13b	3.24	vii.11b
5.1–6	x.4c	5.41 [Luke 8.54]	iv.12ee
5.7	viii.1a	8.8 [Matt 15.37]	x.4g
5.12	vii.5e	8.34 [Mark 10.31, Luke 9.23,	
		18.22]	ix.22a
Sirach		10.31 [Mark 8.34, Luke 9.23,	
2.10–11	ix.25a	18.22]	ix.22a
24.21	viii.5e	14.10 [Matt 26.14, 25, Luke 22.4,	
27.1	ix.22d	48]	iii.2a
27.25	ix.22d	14.22 [Matt 26.26, 1; Cor 11.25]	x.4d
29.27a[21]	x.4f		
		Luke	
Baruch		2.14	v.6b, v.11a
3.36–38	vi.6b	4.4 [Deut 8.3, 4.4]	x.4d
		4.18	iv.12cc
Wisdom		8.54 [Mark 5.41]	iv.12ee
1.16–2:9 (Peshitta)	i.1a	9.23 [Mark 8.34, Mark 10.31,	
		18.22]	ix.22a
Matthew		12.2–3	vii.7a
4.4 [Deut 8.3, Luke 4.4]	x.4d	12.8 [Matt 10.32]	ix.21c
5.12	v.3b	12.17–20 [Lev 26.16]	vii.3c
6.10	iv.6c	12.48	ix.21a
8.17 [Isa 53.4, 1 Pet 2.24]	ix.13a	10.21 [Matt 11.25–6]	Book 6.5b
10.28	ix.26b	18.22 [Mark 8.34, Mark 10.31,	
10.32 [Luke 12.8]	vii.11b, ix.21c	9.23]	ix.22a
11.25–6 [Luke 10.21]	vi.5b	22.4, 48 [Matt 26.14, 25,	
13.25	vii.11b	Mark 14.10]	iii.2a
15.37 [Mark 8.8]	x.4g	24.18 [24.30–32]	x.4g
16.18	iv.12c, v.12b*, ix.21a	24.30 [John 21.13, Acts 1.3]	x.4g
16.26	iv.6a	24.30–32 [24.18]	x.4g
21.9 [Ps 117[118].26 and elsewhere]	v.4c		

John

1.14	iv.12k
3.31	viii.7a
4.35	ix.16g
6.31–58	x.4c
6.33	x.4c
6.51	x.4c, x.4d
6.54, 56	x.4c
7.32 (Peshitta)	viii.7b*
7.53–8.11	viii.7b
8.10 (Peshitta)	viii.7b*
8.12	viii.7b*
8.21	viii.7b*
10.29	ix.25a
12.9	viii.7b*
14.15	ix.13d
15.5	iv.12f
17.5	iv.12j
19.22	iii.3c
20.19	ix.23b
21.13 [Luke 24.30, Acts 1.3]	x.4g

Acts

1.3 [Luke 24.30, John 21.13]	x.4g
1.7	xii.7o
1.21	x.4g
9.15	ix.24a
10.9–16	xii.7p
18.3	vi.5b

Romans

3.28	ix.12a
3.28 [Rom 4.5, Gal 2.16, Gal 3.9, Eph 2.8–9]	ix.13c
4.5 [Rom 3.28, Gal 2.16, Gal 3.9, Eph 2.8–9]	ix.13c
4.9–10	ix.13c
8.18	ix.26b
8.35	ix.24a
11.25	xii.7o
12.15	vii.11b
12.21	ix.16h

1 Corinthians

1.4–8	ix.13d
1.19–20	vi.5a
1.27–28	ix.25a
2.31–32	x.4d
3.11, 10	iv.12e
8.6	iv.12k
11.16	ix.15b
11.25 [Matt 26.26, Mark 14.22]	x.4d
11.27, 29	x.4d
11.27–29	x.4c
11.28–29	x.4d
12.27 [Gal 5.15]	vii.11b
13.5	v.4c
14.2	ix.22c
15.3	ix.22b
15.21–22	ix.22b
15.27 [Ps 108[109].9]	vi.6c

2 Corinthians

1.4	viii.5b
2.11	ix.20a
1.5	ix.26b
4.18	ix.22a
8.9	iii.1i
9.15	ix.22a
12.9	vi.5b
15.19	ix.22a

Galatians

1.8	v.6c, vi.6b
1.8–9	iv.12jj
2.16 [Rom 4.5; 3.28, Gal 3.9, Eph 2.8–9]	ix.13c
2.20	ix.26a
3.9 [Rom 4.5; 3.28, Gal 2.16, Eph 2.8–9]	ix.13c
3.1–25	Book 6.5b
5.6	ix.13d
5.15 [1 Cor 12.27]	vii.11b, ix.13e

528 THE CHRONICLE OF PSEUDO-ZACHARIAH RHETOR

Ephesians		2.20–23	ix.13d
2.8–9 [Rom 3.28, 4.5, Gal 2.16, Gal 3.9]	ix.13c	2.21–24	ix.13c
2.14	v.6b	1 Timothy	
2.14–16 [4.13]	v.11a	2.6 [Eph 5.2, 1 Pet 1.18, 19]	vi.6a
4.1–3	ix.22d	3 [Titus 1.5–9]	ix.21a
4.13 [2.14–16]	v.11a	4 [1 Tim 6.11–20]	ix.25a
5.2 [1 Tim 2.6, 1 Pet 1.18, 19]	vi.6a	4.8	x.4d
6.17	v.11a	5.21	v.6c
		6.8	x.4g
Colossians		6.11–20 [1 Timothy 4]	ix.25a
2.11–12	ix.13c	2 Timothy	
Philippians		3.6 [Philip 3.19]	iv.12ii
2.7	iv.12l, vi.6b	Titus	
2.7–8	iv.12k	1.5–9 [1 Tim 3]	ix.21a
2.17 [4.4]	ix.22a	3.7	ix.21a
3.19 [2 Tim 3.6]	iv.12ii	3.9	ix.15b
4.4 [2.17]	ix.22a	3.10, 11	iv.12jj
1 Thessalonians		1 Peter	
3.9	ix.26b	1.18, 19 [Eph 5.2, 1; Tim 2.6]	vi.6a
Hebrews		2.22	ix.16f, ix.26d
2.14	ix.26f	2.24 [Isa 53.4, 8.17]	ix.13a
2.14–15	ix.26d	1 John	
2.14–17	ix.22b	4.1–3	iv.12jj
2.14–18	iv.12d	2 John	
2.15	ix.26f	1.7	iv.12jj
2.16	iii.1h, iv.12z	1.10, 11	iv.12jj
2.16–17	vi.6b, ix.26e	Joseph and Aseneth	i.0, i.1j
2.17	iii.1h	Acts of Paul and Thecla	
2.12 [Ps 22[23].23 Peshitta]	iii.1i	3.23	x.4g
6.13–14	ix.16b	Protoevangelium of James	
9–10	iii.1i	18.1, 19.1–3, 20.4, 21.3	v.11a
10.28–29	x.4c	Pseudo-Clement	
11.25–26	ix.26a	Homilies 12.6.4	
12.22–23	ix.22d	[Recognitions, 7.6.4]	x.4g
13.8	iv.12l		
James			
1.2–4	vii.14a		
1.17	ix.15b		
2.20	ix.12a		

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO *CPG*

Index of works referred to with a designation in *Clavis Patrum Graecorum (CPG)*

1772	iv.12l	5948	ii.2d
2093	iv.12e	[5953]	ii.2d
2095	iv.12h	5960	iv.8
2589	iv.12w	5965	iv.7
2590	iv.12x	5991	v.11a
2591	iv.12y	5996	vi.4d, vi.5
2837	iv.12n	5997	v.2a
3010	iv.12p	5998	v.5a
3150	iv.12o	5999	v.8a
3645	iv.12m	6493	x.4
3646	iv.12j	6500	ii.3
3665	iv.12g	6515	v.12a
3705	iv.12q	6522	v.9c
4369	iv.12r	6718	iv.9b
4528	iv.12s	6996	15–18
4560	iv.12t	7000	13–14
5217	iv.12cc	7001	13–14
5221	iv.12aa	7026	ix.9b
5230	iv.12ee	7032	ix.12f
5259	iv.12z	7070(4)	ix.16a
5339	vi.6a	7070(5)	ix.20a
5346	iv.12dd	7070(6)	ix.22a
5453	iii.1g	7070(7)	ix.23a
5454	iii.1g	7071(64)	ix.23a
5476	iv.12a	7086	ix.21a
5477	iv.12a	7087	ix.21a
5480	iv.12a	7088	ix.25a
5482	iv.11b	7148	ix.24a
5485	iv.5c	7149	ix.26a
5496	vi.4d, vi.6	9106	v.3a
5497	v.7e	9142	v.9c
5897	ii.5	9145	vi.4d
5933	ii.2d	9148	vi.4d
5935	ii.2d		

INDEX OF PERSONS AND PLACES MENTIONED IN XII.4

(THE SECTION DERIVED FROM PTOLEMY'S *GEOGRAPHY*)

All references are to paragraphs within xii.4. An asterisk indicates that the term appears in the notes rather than the text.

Achaea, c(xxvi)	Asia, province, f(i)
Africa, province, d(iii)	Asnoetoi, g(x)
Agisymba, e(ii)	Aspithrai, h(iii)
Agobeni, f(xix)	Assyria, g(ii)
Agora, Gates of, f(xix)*, g(iii)	Astabênoi, g(x)
Akaritai, g(xiv)	Athens, c(xxvi)
Akhanitu, Gulf of, g(viii)	Attica, c(xxvi)
Albania, f(xii)	Auphirai, g(viii)
Alexander the Great, c(xv), g(v), g(xiii)	Axum, e(i)
Alexandria, Egypt, d(v)	
Alumitai, g(viii)	Babylon, f(xix), g(i)
Ambastai, h(iii)	Bactria, g(xii)
Aninakhai, h(ii)	Bactrians, g(xii)
Anthropophagoi, h(ii)*	Badeô, g(viii)*
Antymandrians, g(xviii)	Badiamaioi, h(i)*
Anourogrammon basileion, h(iii)*	Bahkharenai, g(viii)*
Anugira, h(iii)	Baithana basileion Sirtiotelemaïou, h(i)*
Anzygon, c(xvii)	Barag, e(i)
Arabia, f(xvii), g(viii)	Baraiu, g(viii)
Arabia Felix, g(viii)	Barousai islands, h(ii)*
Arabian wilderness, f(xix)	Basanai, h(ii)
Arachosia, g(xxi)	Basileion Baleokourou, h(i)*
Archintai, g(viii)	Basileion Kêrobothrou, h(i)*
Are, g(viii)	Basileion Pandionos, h(i)*
Aria, g(xviii)	Basileion Sôrnagos, h(i)*
Arkatou basileion Sôra, h(i)*	Batani, f(xix)
Armenia, Greater, f(xiii)	Batoi, h(i)*
Armenia, Lesser, f(vii)	Bazion akron, e(i)*
Artania, i	Belgae, c(vii)
Asaboi mountains, g(viii)*	Besyngetai, h(ii)*
Asia, continent, f, <i>ad init.</i>	

- Bet Nahrain, see Mesopotamia, Upper
 Bêttigo, h(i)*
 Bithynia, f(i)
 Biululainai, g(viii)
 Black Mountain, f(xvii)
 Blemyes, e(i)
 Boligai, h(i)
 Bostra, f(xvii)
 Boțana mountains, h(i)
 Brahmans, h(i)
 Brakhmê, h(i)*
 Britain, i*
 Byltai, g(xiv)*
 Bysegini, h(ii)
 Byzantium, c(xxii)

 Cappadocia, f(vi)
 Carmana, g(viii), g(ix)
 Carmania, g(viii)
 Celtogalatia, of [the city of] Lug, c(vi)
 Celtogalatia, southeastern, c(v)
 Chalcedon, f(i)
 Cherson, c(xxiii)
 China, see Seres, Sericans, Serikê,
 Serirkû, Seurikos, Sinoi, Sinon
 Cilicia, f(viii)
 Colchis, f(x)
 Corinth, c(xxvii)
 Crete, c(xxviii)
 Cubit-people, e(i)
 Cyprus, f(xiv)
 Cyrenaica, d(iv)
 Cymus (Corsica), c(xiii)

 Dacharenoi, g(viii)
 Dacia, c(xviii)
 Dagiana, g (xx)
 Dalmatia, c(xii), c(xxiv)
 Dathinai, g(viii)
 Diluphinnitai, h(i)
 Drangiana, g(xx)*
 Drillophyllitai, h(i)*
 Duana, g(viii)

 Edamonos, g(viii)
 Edessenenes, f(xviii)
 Egypt, d(v), f(xvii)
 Emanis, g(viii)
 Ephesus, f(ii)
 Epirus, c(xxv)
 Ethiopia, e, *ad fin.*
 Ethiopia, Inner, e(ii)
 Ethiopia, Outer, e, *ad initi.*, e(i)
 Ethiopians, i
 Ethiopians, Rhapsian, e(ii)
 Ethiopians, western, e(ii)
 Etymandroi, g(xviii)*
 Euphrates, f(xix)
 Europe, c, *ad fin.*
 Europe, northwestern, c(i)

 Galactophagoi, g(xv)
 Galatia, f(iv)
 Gamirai, h(ii)
 Ganata', h(ii)
 Gange, h(i)
 Garai, g(xiv)
 Garanopyrdes, g(vii)
 Gedrosia, g(xxii)*
 Gelai, g(iii)
 Gerdos, g(xxii)
 Germais (Germania), c(ix)
 Gognaba, h(i)
 Gorgun, g(ii)
 Great Gulf, h(ii)
 Grinaioi Scythians, g(xiv)*
 Gymnosophists, h(i)*

 Hagar, children of, f(xix)
 Hanikai, h(i)
 Hellespont, c(xxii)
 Hippokoura, h(i)*
 Hippophagoi, f(ix)*, g(v)*, see also
 Scythians, horse-eating
 Hispania, Inner, c(iii)
 Hispania, Outer, c(ii)
 Hispania, Tertia, c(iv)

Huzaye, g(v)*	Libya, Inner, d(vi)
Hyrkania, g(x)	Lina, h(ii)
	Linus, Mt, e(ii)
Iabadiou, h(ii)*	Lycia, f(iii)
Iberia, f(xi)	
Ichthyophagoi, e(ii)*, g(viii)*, h(iii)*	Macedonia, c(xxiv)
Imaus mountains, g(xv)*	Madiaminoi, h(i)
India, i	Malikhai, g(viii)
India, Inner, h(ii)	Mamitinoi, g(viii)
India, Outer, h(i)	Mandalai, h(i)
Iobarites, g(viii)*	Maniklai, h(ii)
Iritnaiai, g(viii)	Maniolai islands, h(ii)*
Isatikhai, g(vii)	Margiana, g(xi)
Isauria, f(iv)	Mariconite nard, h(ii)
Isimon mountains, g(xv)	Maroundai, h(ii)*
	Marton, Mt, g(viii)
Jaxartes, river, g(xiv)*	Marudai, g(iii)
Jerusalem, f(xv), f(xvi)	Marurai, h(ii)
	Masônitai, g(viii)*
Kadousioi, g(iii)*	Massagetai, g(xiv)*
Kadutai, h(ii)	Mauretania, d(i)
Kakobai, h(ii)	Mauretania, Outer, d(ii)
Karatai, g(xiv)*	Maxeraï, g(x)
Karman basileion, g(viii)*	Media, g(iii)
Katadrai, e(i)	Melakhitai, g(viii)
Kauchabenoï, f(xix)	Menambis basileion, g(viii)*
Khalinê, h(ii)*	Mesopotamia, Upper, f(xviii)
Kharai, g(viii)	Midura, h(i)
Khatramôthitai, g(viii)*	Minaiai, g(viii)
Klimax, Mt, g(viii)*	Modoura, h(i)*
Koloboi, e(i)*	Moesia, Lower, c(xix)
Komaroi, g(xiv)	Moesia, Upper, c(xx)
Komedai, g(xiv)	Mokritaioi, g(viii)
Korankalai, h(ii)	Monychiati, f(xvii)
Kortatha métropolis, h(ii)*	Moon, Mountain of the, e(ii)*
Kottabanoi, g(viii)	Motikai, g(viii)
Kottis, h(i)	Mulab, e(i)
Koudoutai, h(ii)*	
Kramai, h(i)	Nangalogai, h(ii)*
Kurds, f(xix)*, g(iii)	Nanikhai, h(i)*
Kythebanitai, g(viii)	Narbonesia, c(viii)
	Nile, e(ii)
Libya, d, <i>ad init.</i> , <i>ad fin.</i>	Nitriotis, d(v)

- Nyk', g(v)
 Odenus Artacum, h(i)
 Ophir, Mt, g(viii)
 Orchenii, f(xix)
 Orthura, h(i)
 Ozênê basileion Tiastanou, h(i)*

 Pagasasai, h(ii)
 Palestine, f(xvi)
 Pamphylia, f(v)
 Pan, Mt, e(i)
 Pannonia, c(x)
 Pannonia, Lower, c(xi)
 Paragnata, c(xv)
 Pargadikinai, g(ix)
 Paropanisadon, g(xix)
 Pasargadai, g(ix)*
 Passalai, h(ii)*
 Pêchinoi, e(i)*
 Peloponnesus, c(xxvii)
 Persia, g(v)
 Persian Gulf, g(viii)
 Persians, g, *ad init.*
 Pesandaraï, e(i)
 Philippi, c(xxiv)
 Pontic Sea, f(i)
 Porurai, h(i)
 Prasiakoi, h(i)
 Prigylipum, h(ii)
 Probaus, h(iii)

 Qadishites, g(ii), g(iii)

 Ravana basileion, g(viii)*
 Rawa'a, Mt, h(iii)
 Rhandamarkotta, h(ii)*
 Rhapsian Ethiopians, see Ethiopians
 Rhathinai, g(viii)*
 Rhavana, h(iii)*
 Rhizophagoi, e(i)*
 Rhosus, f(xv)
 Rome, d(iii)

 Sabaeans, g(viii)*
 Sabai, h(i)
 Sabariboi islands, h(ii)
 Sabaroi, h(i)
 Sabê basileion, g(viii)*
 Sagetai, g(xiv)
 Sakai, g(xiv)*
 Sakhalintai, g(viii)
 Sakkon, g(xiv)
 Sardon mountains, h(i)
 Sarmatia, c(xv), f(ix), i
 Sarmatians, i
 Satirampon, h(iii)
 Satyron, h(ii)
 Saudra batis, h(i)*
 Schosotai, g(ix)
 Scythia, g(xv)
 Scythia, Inner, g(xvi)
 Scythians, g(xvii), i
 Scythians, horse-eating, g(xvi)
 Semanothinoi, h(iii)
 Seres, i
 Sericans, i
 Serikê (China), g(xvii)*
 Serirkû, i
 Seurikos (China), g(xvii)
 Shabbaioi, g(viii)
 Shabbar, e(i)
 Shakhalittoi, g(viii)
 Shawa, g(viii)
 Sheba, g(viii)
 Sicily, c(xiv)
 Sinai, Mt, f(xix)
 Sindai, h(ii)*
 Sinoi, i
 Sinon (China), h(iii)
 Sitirai, g(viii)
 Skênitai, g(viii)*
 Sogdiana, g(xiii)
 Sophanitai, g(viii)
 Souzaioi, g(v)*
 Sôxotai, g(ix)*
 Struthophagoi, e(i)*

Susiana, g(iv)
 Syria, f(xv)
 Syrian Gates, f(xv)

Tabasoi, h(i)
 Tamêrai, h(ii)*
 Taprobane, h(iii)*
 Tauricinus, c(xvi)
 T̥ayy, f(xvii), g(viii)
 Thrace, c(xxi), c(xxiv)
 Tighun, h(i)
 Tiladai, h(ii)*
 Tobazium, e(i)

Toornai, g(xiv)*
 Triglyphon basileion, h(ii)*
 Trilingon basileion, h(ii)*
 Turnai, g(xiv)

Ulamites, g(viii)*
 Urtaioi, g(viii)

Wanedqur, h(i)
 Wathana, h(i)

Zarma, g(viii)
 Zeiritai, g(viii)*

GENERAL INDEX

The terms God, Christ, and the Virgin Mary have been excluded since they are so frequent, as have references to Chalcedonians and anti-Chalcedonians. We have used page numbers for the Introduction (save section F, which forms part of the translation of Pseudo-Zachariah), but book, chapter and section numbers for the translation. If a term is cited in all sections of a chapter, then we have merely indicated the chapter number rather than all the letters of the sections; this applies also if there is just one section in a chapter. An asterisk indicates that the term is found in the notes of the section, not in the text itself. The descriptions used, e.g. 'heretic', are based on PZ's judgement rather than our own. NT and OT refer to the New and Old Testaments, CP to Constantinople; we have referred to all bishops, be they patriarchs or metropolitans, as bp, save for popes. The index excludes xii.7c-i, the extract derived from Ptolemy's Geography, which has been accorded its own index. If a term appears, for instance, in sections a and f of book 7, chapter 6, then we simply refer to it here as vii.6af.

- Aaron, bp of Arsamosata, viii.5b
- (Mar) Aba, monastery of, viii.5d
- Abarne, village, xii.6*
- Abasgi, xii.7k(v)*
- Abdel, xii.7k(ix)
- Abgarshat, fort, ix.4
- Abel, OT patriarch, iv.12n, vi.5b
- Abgersaton, see Abgarshat
- Abkhaz, xii.7k(v)*
- Abraham, archimandrite, vii.4a
- Abraham bar Kaili, bp of Amida,
 - becomes priest, vii.6f
 - persecutes Miaphysites in Amida, x.0, 2, xii.6*
 - visits Alexandria, x.1d
 - mentioned, viii.5b*, x.1a*
- Abraham, OT patriarch, descendants
 - of, iii.1h
 - seed of, iv.12dz, vi.6b, ix.22b
 - statue of in Rome, x.16b
 - mentioned, 40, ix.13cd, 22a
- Abraham, son of Euphrasius, viii.3a
- Abraham 'the humble', viii.5c
- Abritus, 40
- Absalom, OT king, i.1f, iii.2a
- Abûsîr, village, see Tomb of Osiris
- Acacian schism, v.8a*
- Acacius, bp of CP, rival of Gennadius,
 - iv.11b
 - succeeds Gennadius, iv.11c, vi.7a
 - helps Egyptian monks, v.1a
 - on good terms with Timothy
- Aelurus, v.1b
- passivity of, v.4b*
- forces Basiliscus to issue
 - Antencyclicon*, 69, v.0c, 5a
- receives *libellus*, v.5b
- architect of *Henoticon*, 70, v.8a*

- accepts *Henoticon*, v.0e
 receives letter from bp Calendion, v.9c
 writes to Peter Mongus, v.10b, 11
 hears of splits in Egyptian church, vi.1ab
 dies, vi.4d
 mentioned, 24, 26, 28–9, iv.12mm, v.0d, 2a*, 3b*, 6a*, 6f, 7ab, 9b*, vi.6c
 Acacius Bar Eshkapa, chiliarch, x.1d
acheiropoiētos icon, xii.4
 Acra, city, vii.13c
Acta (pepragmena), ii.0a, ii.0d, ii.2a, ii.2d, ii.3, iii.1f
 Ad Decimum, battle, ix.17c
 Adam, OT patriarch, 40, iv.12inpx, ix.22b, 26d, x.4d
 ‘Adon, see Cyrus ‘Adon
 Aeneas, Trojan prince, x.15b*
 Aeneas of Gaza, 8–9, 13–15, 17
 Aetheric, see Eutharius, bp of Tyana
 Aetius, deacon, iii.1k
 Aetius, general, 67
 Africa, province, 72, ii.5, ix.0b, ix.17, x.9
Against Julian the Fantasiast, work of Severus, vii.10e
Against the Grammarian, work of Severus, 53, vii.10e
 Agapetus, pope, succeeds to throne, ix.18*
 summoned to CP, ix.15k, 19c
 comes to CP, 12, 71, ix.19d, x.1a
 dies, ix.19e, x.1a
 mentioned, iii.1d*
 Agathias, historian, 9
 Agathon, priest, vi.4a
 Aglaophon, addressee of treatise, i.1g
 Aglon, Persian governor, vii.4f, 5abc
 Ahaz, OT king of Judah, x.15b
 Aiulfus, see Sulifus
 Akatziri, see Khasir
 ‘Akephaloi’, vi.2c*, 4f*
 Akoimetai, monastery of, 26, v.2e*, vii.7a, 8j*
 Alans, xii.7k(vi)
 Albania (Caucasian), vii.4d, xii.7k(iii), (v)*, m
 Aleppo, see Beroea
 Alexander, ambassador, ix.7b*
 Alexander, bp of Hierapolis, ix.21c
 Alexander Romance, xii.7k(x)*
 Alexandria, city, student life in, 5–6, 8
 mentioned, 15–17, 37–8, 44, ii.4, iii.0ab, 2a, 9b, 10, iv.1a, 4a*, 5a, 8a, 9a, 11a, 12ff, v.0d, 1a*, 4b, 4d*, 4f, 6d*, 6e, 7b, 8a, 9a, vi.0, 2a*, 2c*, 4ade, 6b, 7a, vii.0, 1b, 10d*, viii.5ab, ix.13e, 16de, 19bc, 24e*, x.1d, 9, 16a*, 455
 Alexandria, patriarchate of, 22, 24, iii.1a, iv.10d, 12ll*, mm, v.2b, 8a*, vi.1a, 6e, vii.1b, 10d, 15, viii.5b, ix.22d, 25a, x.1b
 Alexandrians, iii.11a, iv.9a, 12a, v.1a, 4b, 5b, 6e, vi.6c, vii.14a
 Alypius, bp of Caesarea, 3.1e*
 Amalasuintha, Gothic ruler, ix.18*
 Amantius, *praepositus*, viii.0, 1b
 Amasea, city, xii.4
 Amazons, xii.7k(x), k(xi)*
 Ambrose, bp of Milan, cited, iv.12v
 Amida, city, afflicted by famine, vii.2
 besieged and captured, 54–5, vii.0, 3–4, 14b, xii.7l
 starvation at, vii.0, 5
 persecutions in, x.0, x.2, x.16b*
 madness at, 35, xii.5a*
 visited by Peter the Patrician, xii.4
 mentioned, 32–3, 35–8, 48, 56, i.9b, vii.6ac, viii.5a*, 5b, ix.4–5, 6b, 9c, x.1a, 1bc, xii.5c*
 Amis, village, viii.5a
 ‘Amkhoru, vii.4d
 Ammodius, see ‘Amodin

- Ammonius, philosopher, 8, 14–15
 ‘Amodin, vii.6b, ix.3
 Amos, OT prophet, vi.5b*
 Amphilochius, bp of Side, at
 Chalcedon, iii.1ek
 condemns Leo’s encyclical, 25–6,
 58, iv.0b, 7a,
 refuses to sign Basiliscus’ *Antien-*
 cyclicon, 5.0c
 Amun, ‘Wild Bull’, monk, v.1a, vi.1c*
 Anachristo-Novatians, see Schismatic
 monks
 Ananias of Shirak, xii.7a*b*
 Anastasia, wife of Pompey, ix.6b*
 Anastasiopolis, see Dara
 Anastasius, emperor, succeeds to
 throne, 55, vi.6e, vii.1a
 crushes Isaurians, 67, vii.2
 kindness to Mesopotamia, vii.5e
 fortifies Dara, 68, vii.6
 receives Chalcedonian works, 454–6
 deposes Macedonius, vii.7–8
 encouraged by Marinus, vii.9
 convenes council of Sidon, vii.10b
 praised by council of Sidon, vii.11a
 convenes council of Tyre, vii.12c
 Theoderic rebels against, vii.12d
 empire plundered by Vitalian,
 vii.13b
 ransoms nephew Hypatius, vii.13c
 dies, 43, vii.14
 mentioned for dating, vi.7a, vii.0,
 2, 3a, 6a, 15, viii.2b, 5c*, ix.18,
 20*, 21b*, 454–6
 mentioned, 3, 30, 54, 68, 70, vi.4f*
 Anastasius, bp of Antioch, iv.12mm,
 v.0e
 Anastasius, bp of Jerusalem, signs
 Encyclicon, v.2e
 refuses to sign *Antencyclicon*, v.5b
 mentioned, v.6a
 Anatolius, bp of CP, succeeds Flavian,
 ii.3
 at Chalcedon, iii.1e
 organises Leo’s Encyclical, iv.5a
 abused by pope Leo, iv.5c
 writes to pope Leo, iv.0c
 influences bps, iv.7a
 writes to emperor Leo, 51, iv.8a
 mentioned, 23, 58, ii.4, iv.10d,
 12mm
 Anatolius, brother of bp Timothy
 Aelurus, iv.1b*, iv.12ff, v.4e
 Andrew, brother of bp Asclepius,
 viii.4a
 Andrew, *cubicularius*, viii.0, 1b
 Andrew, deacon, vi.4d, 5d, vii.1b
 Andrew, monk, iii.6a*
 Andrew of Samosata, heretic, vii.8o,
 ix.21c
 Andrew, *rabba*, vi.1a, 2b, 4a, 4c*
 Anglon, battle of, x.0*
 Anna, NT prophetess, viii.7a
 Anthemius, emperor, iii.0b, 11b, 12,
 iv.0a, 5a
 Anthemius, *augustalis*, v.5c*
 Anthimus, author, iv.11b*
 Anthimus, bp of CP, succeeds to
 throne, ix.19a
 exchanges letters with Severus
 and Theodosius, 47, ix.0b, 19d,
 21–2, 25–6
 expelled from CP, x.1a
 mentioned, 11–12
 Anticaesar, title, vi.6e, vii.12d, ix.1a,
 18*
Antencyclicon, 24, 26, 69, v.0c, 5ab
 Antioch, city, struck by earthquake
 (457), iii.12a
 council of (509), vii.10b*
 council of (513), vii.10d*
 struck by earthquake (526), viii.0,
 4d
 council of (537/8), x.5
 captured by Khusro, 72, x.0, 5, 6a
 mentioned, 38, ii.4, iii.9a, iv.11a*,

- v.6f, 10a, vii.4f*, 6g, 8b, 9, 10b, 12c, viii.5acf, ix.6c, x.0, 1ab, 9, xii.6
- Antioch, patriarchate of, 22
- Antiochenes, x.16a*
- Antoninus, bp of Beroea, viii.5b
- Antoninus Pius, emperor, x.16a*
- Antony, calm man, viii.5d
- Apad(a)na, vii.5a, c*, ix.2a*
- Apamea, vi.4d, vii.3, 4e*, 9, 12c, viii.1a, 5a, c*, x.6a
- Aphphadana, ix.2a
- Aphrodito, v.6e*
- Apion, patrician, 455
- Apollinarius, heresiarch, iii.1a*, 9b, 10b, iv.6b, iv.12g*^ju*, ix.15d, 21c
- Apollo of Caesarea, iv.12ll*
- Apollonius, *augustalis*, v.7b*
- (Mar) Aqiba monastery, vii.10b, viii.5c
- Aquilinus, bp of Byblus, ii.3*
- ‘Arab, 61, vii.0, 2, 6b, viii.5c, ix.2a, 3, 8
- Arabia, province, v.10a, vii.10d, 12c, x.9, 12
- Arabia Felix, iv.12ll*, viii.3d*
- Arabs, vii.3c, 6a*, 14a, x.6a
- Arathu, bp of Ingila, viii.5b
- Arcadius, emperor, mentioned for dating, 48, i.1k, i.9a
- donation to the Egyptian church, v.6g
- mentioned, 67
- Archelaus, bp of Caesarea, vi.4d, vii.1b
- Archelaus, praetorian prefect, ix.17c
- Arches, monastery of, see Deir d’Qubba
- Ardaburius, general, iii.12a*
- Areobindus, general (under Theodosius II), 41, ii.5
- Areobindus, general (under Anastasius), vii.4g, 5a
- Ares, god, xii.7k(xi)*
- Arethas, see Harith
- Ariadne, empress, 42, 55, vii.0, 1a, 8b, 13a
- Arianism, vii.12d
- Arians, 3, iv.1b, 7a, ix.17c
- Ariminum, council of, v.6c, ix.17c
- Arius, heresiarch, i.7, iii.1c, ix.21c, 454
- Armatus, nephew of Verina, v.1a*
- Armenia (Roman), vii.3b, x.9 (see also Persarmenia)
- Armenians, v.8a*
- Arnigisclus, general, ii.5*
- Arran, see Albania
- Artemia, supposed daughter of Diocletian, ix.6d*
- Arzamon, river, vii.5a*
- Arzanians, see Arzanene
- Arzanene, Persian border region, vii.5a, viii.5a, c*, ix.5, 6a, x.6a
- Arsenius, *augustalis*, v.0e, vi.0, vi.4a-c
- Asael, OT warrior, x.12
- Asclepius, bp of Edessa, viii.4ab, 5c*
- Aseneth (Asyath), 46, 48, 53–4, i.0, i.1j, i.4–6
- Asia (Minor), bishops of, v.2e, 3a, 5b
- Asia Minor, 67, xii.7b*
- Aspar, general, 42, 67, iii.12a, iv.7a, 11c*
- Assyrians, vii.6a, ix.8, x.5
- Asthebid, general, ix.4
- Aštišat, xii.7k(i)*
- Asylus, bp of Resh‘aina, ix.19c
- Athalaric, Gothic king, ix.18*
- Athanasius, bp of Alexandria, cited, iv.12e–i, u, ix.15f
- mentioned, ii.2a, iii.1g, iii.9b*, iii.11a*, vii.12a*, ix.12b
- Athanasius II, bp of Alexandria, vi.4f, 6d, 6e, 7a, vii.1b, 15
- Athenodorus, Isaurian leader, vii.2*
- Attachae, ix.5*, 6b*
- Atakhaya, district of, ix.5, 6b*
- Atticus, presbyter, iv.8a*
- Attila, king of the Huns, iii.1d*

- Audanus, *dux*, xii.6
 Aurelian, emperor, x.16b*
 Aurelianae quarter, CP, vii.8a*
 Auxonius, brother of bp Eustathius, iv.9b
 Avars, xii.7k(ix)
 'Awa, city, ix.8
- Ba'albek, viii.0, 4ac
 Babel, Tower of, i.1b*
 Babylon, ix.8
 Bagank', xii.7k(v)*
 Bagarsik, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
 Balasagan, xii.7k(v)
 Balash, Persian king, xii.7k(iii)*
 Balikh, river, viii.5a, d*
 Balkans, 67–8, 72, ix.18*
 Balshazar, OT king, x.4c
 Bar Gabala, Arab king, ix.6b
 Bar Korgis, priest, xii.6
 Bar Shahima, viii.4d
 Bar Yohannan, x.2*
 Bara, village, iv.1b*
 Barachus, bp of Bacatha, vii.6b*
 Bardaisan, heresiarch, ix.9a
 el-Bare, village, viii.5c
 Baresmanes, general, ix.3*
 Barethu, village, iv.1b*
 Barhebraeus, chronicler, 45, 59–60
 Barnikinâ, miracle-worker, viii.5d
 Barsalia, xii.7k(vii)*, (ix)*
 Barsauma, bp of Nisibis, ix.21c
 Barsauma, holy man, x.4a*
 Barsêlt, see Bagarsik
 Basil, bp of Caesarea, cited, iv.12n, ix.21c
 mentioned, ii.2a, vii.12a
 Basil, bp of Seleucia, iii.1c*
 Basil, bp of Traianopolis, iii.1j
 Basil, general, ix.2b
 Basileios Stoa, Constantinople, 10
 Basiliscus, usurper, seizes power, iv.11c*, 12II, v.1a, vi.6e, vii.2
 issues *Encyclicon*, 51–2, 69, v.0a, 1ab, 2
 receives *libellus* from Timothy Aelurus, v.4e
 issues *Antiencyclicon*, 69, v.5a
 ousted by Zeno, 26, v.0c, 5a
 mentioned, 23, 42, vii.8j*
 Basiliscus, priest, xii.6
 Bassianus, bp of Ephesus, iv.0bc, 5a, 12mm, v.0b, 4b*
 Bassianus, monastery of, CP, vii.8j*
 Bassibrina, see Bet Severini
 (Mar) Bassus, monastery of, viii.5c
 Batnae, town, x.1b, 10b
 Batzas, *dux*, x.1c*
 Baysar, Christian boy, viii.3f*
 Bazgun, see Balasagan
 Bazu, monastery of, viii.5c
 Bederiana, vii.14b*, viii.1a*
 Beersheba, ix.22a*
 Beirut, 6–8, 16–17, iv.9b, vii.10d*
 Belabitene, viii.5b*
 Belisarius, general, takes command in East, ix.2a
 defeated at Tannuris, ix.2b
 victorious at Dara, 71, ix.3
 defeated at Callinicum, 71, ix.4
 sacked by Justinian, ix.6b, ix.17a
 captures Carthage, ix.0b, 17c
 captures Rome and Naples, ix.0b, 18
 captures Sisauranon, x.0
 recaptures Rome, x.15a*
 mentioned, vii.7b*, viii.5a*, ix.5
 Berbers, ix.17c
 Berenicianus, viii.5d*
 Beroea, vii.6g*, viii.5c*, x.0, 1b, 6a
 Beruta, see Abritus
 Berytus, see Beirut
 Bessas, general, ix.5, 6ac
 Bet Attakhaya, see Attakhaya
 Bet Brw', see Brw'
 Bet Gaugal, viii.5c

- Bet Helte, ix.5
 Bet Išḥaqûnî, monastery, Amida,
 viii.5c, xii.7l
 Bet Nahrain, see Mesopotamia, Upper
 Bet Severini, viii.5a*
 Bet Shurla, viii.5b
 Bet Tirai, monastery of, vii.6g, viii.5c
 Bethel, ix.20
 Bethlehem, v.6a*
 Birwai, doctor, xii.7p
 Bitabo, village, viii.5c*
 Bithynia, ii.4
 Black Sea, xii.7k(v)*
 Blue Faction, ix.14a*
 Boa, queen, vii.3a*, xii.7n*
 Boazanes, bp, ix.6d*
 Boethius, philosopher, ix.18*
 Boetius, prefect of Egypt, v.4f
 Book of Life, iii.2a, iv.5a, 11c
 Book of the Himyarites, viii.3a*
 Bosporius, bp of Neocaesarea, 12
 Bosporus, vii.7a
 Boutzes, general, ix.2b, 3*, 4, 6a,
 x.1c*
 Brw', family of, 46, i.0
 Bulgars, xii.7k(vi)*, (ix)*
 Burgar (tribe), xii.7k(vi), (ix)
 Burugundi, xii.7k(ix)*
 But..., x.1c
 Byzacium, ix.17c*
 Byzantium, 48, x.9 (see also CP)

 Caesarea, Cappadocia, iii.1c*, ix.14a,
 xii.4a
 Caesarea, Palestine, 7
 Caesarion, see Great Church, Alexan-
 dria
 Calendon, bp of Antioch, succeeds
 Peter the Fuller, v.5b
 critical of Peter Mongus, v.9c
 exposed by Philoxenus, vii.10a
 mentioned, 31
 Callinicum, battle of, 71, ix.4, 6b*
 Callinicum, viii.5d, x.0, 1b, xii.6*
 Calliopius, praetorian prefect, vii.6b*
 Calopodius, steward, vii.8n*
 Camulia, village, xii.4a
 Canaan, i.1c
 Canaanites, ix.23a
 Candace, NT queen, iv.1a
 Canopus, monastery of, v.4c*, 6e*, 9a
 Cappadocia, province, x.9
 Caput Vada, town, ix.17c*
 Cardonians, see Corduene
 Carthage, ii.5, ix.0b, 17bc, x.16b*
 Caspian Gates, xii.7k(v), 7m*
 Caspian Sea, xii.7k(iii)*, (v)*, (vii)*
 Cassiodorus, author, xii.7a
 Castra Mauriana, vii.14b, viii.1a, ix.1a
 Catalaunian Plains, battle, 67
Catechesis, work of Severus, vii.10e
 Caucasus region, 5, 51, 72, vii.3a*,
 5c*, 6c*, xii.7k-n
 Celer, *domesticus*, viii.0, 2
 Celer, *magister officiorum*, arrives in
 East, vii.4g
 nearly executes Cyrus, vii.4f
 recovers Amida, 36, vii.5d
 sympathises with Macedonius,
 vii.7b
 criticised by Anastasius, vii.8i
 expels Macedonius, vii.8n
 mentioned, vii.5a*
 Celestine, pope, ii.2a, 4, v.2b, 10b,
 ix.21b, 25b
 Chalcedon, council of (451), described,
 iii.1
 mentioned, 5, 8, 20–4, 29–30, 42–3,
 51–2, 56, 58, 60, 68–71, ii.5,
 iii.0ab, 3ab, 5b, 10a, iv.0b, 5, 6c,
 7a, 8a, 11bc, 12mm, v.0abde, 1b,
 2be, 3a*b, 4bd, 5a*, 6ac, 7bcde,
 8a*c, 9ab, vi.1ac, 2bc, 4bc*e*f*,
 6cd, vii.0, 1b, 7b, 8adf*kno, 9*,
 10bc*d, 11c, 14b*, 15, viii.1b,
 3a*, 4a, 5a, ix.10b*, 15e*ij,

- 19ac*, 21bc, 24c, 25b, 26d,
x.1ab, 5, xii.6*, 454
- Chalcis, see Qenneshrin
- Cherson, place of exile of Timothy
Aelurus, iv.0c, 11a, 12hh*, v.0a,
1a*
- Choricus of Gaza, 4
- Christians, mentioned, ix.4
- Christodorus, deacon, iv.12ff
- Chronicle of 846*, 57
- Chronicle of 1234*, 57
- Chronicon Paschale*, 41–2
- Cilicia, province, v.10a
- Cilicia II, province, ix.6c*
- Circus Flaminius, x.16b*
- Circus Maximus, x.16b*
- Citharizon, see Qithariz
- Claudiopolis, vii.2*, 8n*
- Clement, disciple of Peter, x.4g
- Clement, pope, vii.12a
- Clement of Alexandria, vii.12a
- Clementinus, general, x.1ab
- Clementinus, patrician, vii.8d
- Cleopas, NT figure, x.4g
- Codex Encyclius*, 25, 53, iv.5a*
- Colosseum, x.16b*
- Colossians, Paul's letter to the, ix.13c
- Comitas, persecutor, x.1b
- Conon, Isaurian leader, vii.2*
- Constantia (Tella), vii.2*, 5b, 6a*,
viii.4d, x.1b
- Constantine, bp of Laodicea, viii.5b
- Constantine, emperor, baptism of, 45,
48, 53, i.0, 1j, 7
conversion of, 20
at Council of Nicaea, iii.3b*
model of orthodoxy, v.2c, vii.8l
his church at Antioch, x.5*
mentioned, 37
- Constantine, general (under Anasta-
sius), vii.3b
- Constantine, general (under Justinian),
ix.6b
- Constantinople, city, mentioned, 8,
10–11, 19, 21, 29, 38, 41–2,
48–50, 55, 69, 71, ii.0d, 2a, 4–5,
iii.4a*, 5c, 9b*, 10d, 11c*, 12hh,
ii, v.0a, 1a, 7b, vi.6e, 5c, 6d*,
vii.0, 1, 2*, 4c*, 7a, 8b*h*ij*,
13b, viii.1a, 3f, 4c*, 5bd, f*,
ix.6b*, 14a, 15a, 16c*, 17bc*,
18, 19ac*, de, 20, 22a*, x.1d*,
9*, 12*, xii.4a*, 7k(ix)*
- Constantinople, Council of (381),
iv.12c*, v.2bc, 3b, 5c, 6cd, 7c,
8ab, 10b, vi.2b, vii.8h, ix.15c,
21b, 25b, 26d
- Constantinople, Council of (448), 46,
53, 69, ii.0d
- Constantinople, Council of (536), 11,
ix.18*, 19d*
- Constantinople, Council of (553), 12,
71, vii.7b*, xii.6
- Constantinople, Council of (680),
ix.21b*
- Constantinople, patriarchate of, 22, 44,
55, iii.1a, iv.7a, 12mm, v.8a*,
vii.9, 10d, 15, ix.22a*, 25a
- Corduene, x.6a
- Cosmas, monk, viii.5c
- Cosmas, monk of Mar 'Aqiba, 50, 53,
iv.6d, vii.0, 10b, 11a
- Cosmas, *spatharius*, 14, v.0e, vi.0, 2,
3, 4a
- Counter-Encyclical, see *Antienyclicon*
- Coutzes, general, ix.2b
- Curiosum*, x.16*
- Cut... , x.1c
- Cyriacus, martyr, ix.6d
- Cyril, bp of Alexandria, author of
Glaphyra, 46, i.6
cited, iv.12z-ee, ix.10a, 12b, 26g
teachings of, iii.1e*f*, gj, 11, v.8a*
dies, iii.1b
mentioned, 52, 69, ii.2a, 4, iii.1a*,
9b*, iv.1a, 3b, 12kk, v.2b, 4f*,

- 5c, 8b, 9c, 10b, vi.4e, vi.6a*,
vii.7b*, 12a, ix.12b, 21b, 25b,
26d, 455–6
- Cyrrhestike, district, ix.6c*
- Cyrus, abbot, viii.5c
- Cyrus of Aegae, heretic, ix.21c, 454
- Cyrus, bp of Singara, x.12
- Cyrus, deacon, iv.12ff
- Cyrus, governor, vii.4abf
- Cyrus, priest, 29, v.7a, 9a
- Cyrus 'Adon, priest, vii.6c
- Cyrus of Legîn, x.0
- Cyrus of Sugha, viii.5c
- Cyzicus, iii.1f*
- Dacia Mediterranea, province, ix.1a*
- Dada, see Dodo
- Dadoi, xii.7k(viii)*
- Dadu, Caucasian people, xii.7k(viii)
- Dagestan, xii.7k(viii)*
- Dahdar, see Rumi
- Daisân, river, viii.4b
- Dalmat(i)us, monastery of, CP,
vii.8ab*dj*o
- Daniel, bp of Carrhae, ii.3*, iii.1b*
- Daniel, *chorepiskopos*, viii.5c
- Daniel the Stylite, 69, v.5a
- Danube, river, 67, xii.7k(ix)*
- Dara, city, built, 68, vii.0, 6
battle of, 71, ix.0b, 2b*, 3
coup at, x.1c
mentioned, viii.5bf*, ix.1b, 2b, x.12*
- Dariel Pass, xii.7k(vii)*, m*
- Daroi, xii.7k(viii)*
- David, OT king, i.1f, iii.2a, iv.12l, hh,
ix.22d, 23c, x.4c, 16b
- Decius, emperor, 40, 49, ii.1
- Deir d'Qubba, viii.5c
- Demetrius, student, v.1a*
- Demosthenes, praetorian prefect, viii.4c
- Derbent Pass, xi.77k(vii)*, m*
- Derkos, fortress, x.1b*
- Deuteronomy, Book of, x.5a
- Dhu Nuwas, king, viii.3
- Dido, Caucasian people, xii.7k(viii)*
- Didouroi, xii.7k(viii)*
- Didoykh, xii.7k(viii)*
- Diobulion, village, xii.4a
- Diocletian, emperor, x.16b*
- Diodore, bp of Tarsus, ii.2a, iii.1b,
vii.7b, 8o, 10b, 12b*, viii.4d,
ix.15h, 19d, 21c, 454
- Diogenes, bp of Cyzicus, iii.9b*
- Diolcos monastery, Egypt, vi.1a*
- Diomedes, *silentarius*, iv.6b*c
- Dionysius, bp of Alexandria, 30, iv.1b*
- Dionysius, bp of Corinth, vii.12a
- Dionysius, *comes Aegypti*, iv.1ab, 3a*
- Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, see
under Pseudo-
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, see
under Pseudo-
- Dioscorus, bp of Alexandria, succeeds
Cyril, iii.1b
objects to Tome of Leo, ii.2d
presides at Council of Ephesus
(449), 69, ii.3
condemned and exiled at Council of
Chalcedon, iii.0b, 1defk*, 3b*c
dies at Gangra, 3.11a
honoured by Timothy Wobblecap,
iv.10d
letter to Secundinus, cited, 51,
iii.1hi, iv.12jj
bones brought to Alexandria, v.4e
mentioned, 53, 60, ii.0d, 4, iv.1a,
6d, 12kk, v.2b, 5a*c, 7ade, 9ab*,
vi.4f
- Dioscorus II, bp of Alexandria, 44,
vii.15, viii.5b
- Dirmar, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
- Dith, see Donatus, brother of John
- Dius, monastery of, CP, iii.9ab*, vii.8j*
- Dnieper, river, xii.7k(ix)*
- Dodo, Syriac teacher, 55, i.0, 1k, 9,
viii.5a

- Dogmatic Letter*, work of Severus,
vii.10e
- Dog-men, xii.7k(x)
- Dominic, Italian refugee, 55, vii.12d*,
ix.18, x.15a*
- Domitian, bp of Melitene, x.1a*
- Domitziolus, nephew of Boutzes,
ix.4–5
- Domnentiolus, see Domitziolus
- Domnus, bp of Antioch, at Council of
Ephesus (449), ii.3
backs Eutyches at Ephesus, iii.1f*,
9b
addressee of letters from Dioscorus,
iii.1g
mentioned ii.0d, 4, iv.12mm
- Don, river, xii.7k(ix)*
- Donatus, brother of John, 38, vii.1a, 5e
- Dorotheus, *dux*, iii.5a*
- Dorotheus, general, ix.6b*c*
- Dorotheus, monk, 455–6
- Dorotheus of Marcianopolis, iii.1cd
- Dvin, city, xii.7k(i)
- Dyrrhachium, vii.1a
- Easter, ix.4*
- Easterners (Antiochenes), v.10b
- Easterners, monastery of, viii.5c
- Edessa, city, flooded, 43, viii.0, 4ab
besieged by Khusro, x.0
image of, xii.4a*
mentioned, vii.4f*, 6a*, 12b*,
viii.5c*, x.0, 1b
- Edomites, vii.14a
- Egypt, 5, 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 38,
69–70, iii.3b, 7a*, iv.1a, 5a,
9a, 11a, v.6a*, 7b, 8a, vii.0, 2*,
viii.5b*c*, 7a, ix.8a*, 10b*,
16a*, x.1d*, 9, xii.5a, 7a*
- Eirenaion, vii.7a*
- Eleazar, OT priest, i.1c, xii.7a
- Eleusinus, bp of Sasima, ix.13e
- Eleutheropolis, v.9a*, vii.10d*
- Eli, OT priest, x.4f, 15b
- Elias, author, viii.5b*d
- Elias, bp of Jerusalem, vii.10c*d, 12c,
15
- Elias, *dux*, x.1d*
- Elias of Bet Ishaqûnî, viii.5c
- Elias, old man, viii.5d
- Elias the Potter, monk, vi.1c
- Elisha, presbyter, 11
- Elizabeth, sister of Mary (NT), viii.7a
- Emesa, viii.5a, x.9
- Enaton monastery, iv.1b*
- Encyclical letter of Leo, 69, iv.0bc,
3b*, 5ab, 7, see also *Codex
Encyclius*
- Encyclicon* of Basiliscus, 24, 26, 51–2,
69, iv.12mm, v.0a, 1b, 2–3,
4ab*f, 5a*b, 8a*, vi.1a*
- Ephesus, city, 44, ii.0c, 1, iv.5a, 12mm,
v.0b, 4a, vi.1a
- Ephesus, Council of (431), 46, 53, 68,
ii.2a, 4, iii.1a*, v.2bc, 3b, 4d*,
5c, 6cd, 8b, 10b, vi.2b, vii.7b*,
8a*, ix.15ci, 21b, 25b, 26d
- Ephesus, Council of (449), 46, 49,
52–3, 57, 69, ii.0d, 2a, 3,
iii.1a*b*e*f, 9b*, iv.6b*,
v.2a*bc, 3b, 5c, viii.5c
- Ephesus, Council of (475/6), 26, 51,
v.3a, 4b
- Ephraem, bp of Antioch, succeeds to
throne, viii.4d
alarmed at Severus' presence in CP,
ix.15k, 19b
sends Sergius to Rome, ix.19c
persecutes Miaphysites in East, x.0,
1, xii.6*
installs Zoilus as bp of Alexandria,
x.1d
convenes council at Antioch, x.0, 5
mentioned, viii.6
- Ephraem, Mountain of, i.1e
- Ephraem of Constantia, vii.6f

- Ephraem the Syrian, i.9a, x.4c*
- Ephthalite, see Hephthalite
- Epiphanius, bp of CP, vii.15, viii.1c, 6, ix.19a
- Epiphanius, bp of Magdalon, v.0c, 5b
- Epiphanius, bp of Salamis, 50, iii.1c*
- Ethiopia, iv.12ll
- Ethiopians, viii.3bg*
- Euchaïta, place of exile of Euphemius, vii.1b*, 8n*
- place of exile of Macedonius, vii.7b*, 8n*
- place of exile of Paul of Edessa, viii.4a
- Eudocia, empress, 41, 49, ii.5, iii.4a, 5a*
- Eunomius, heresiarch, ix.21c, 454
- St Euphemia, shrine of at Alexandria, vi.2b
- St Euphemia, shrine of at Chalcedon, iii.1d*k, vii.8n*
- Euphemius, bp of CP, succeeds Fravitta, vi.4d, 7a
- tries to depose Peter Mongus, vi.4d, vii.1b
- receives pledge of orthodoxy from Anastasius, vii.1a*, 8n*
- plots against patriarch Athanasius, vii.1b
- deposed, vii.0, 1b
- mentioned, 30, vii.15
- Euphrasius, bp of Antioch, viii.1c, 4d, 6
- Euphrates, river, viii.5bd*f, ix.0b, 4, 6bc, 17a, x.0, 6a
- Euphratesia, province, v.10a, vii.10d, viii.5c, ix.6c*, x.1c*, 4a*
- Eupraxius, dedicatee of Zach.'s work, 9, 21, iii.0a, 1a, 10a*
- Euprepus, rebel, see Pamprepus
- Eusebius, bp of Ancyra, iii.1e
- Eusebius, bp of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, 20–1, 30, 33, 36–7, 44–5, 48–9, 51, i.1ij, ii.0a
- Chronicle*, 36–7, 40, 43, 48, xii.7a
- Chronography*, 40
- Eusebius, bp of Dorylaeum, 12, ii.2cd, 3, iii.1a*be
- Eusebius, bp of Nicomedia, i.7
- Eusebius, bp of Pelusium, iv.1a*
- (Mar) Eusebius, monastery of, Kefra d-bârâtâ, viii.5c*
- Eusebius, pope, i.7
- Eustathius, Amidene youth, ix.19c
- Eustathius, bp of Antioch, 50, vii.7b, 9
- Eustathius, bp of Beirut, iii.1ek, iv.3b, 9b
- Eustathius, merchant, vii.3a
- Eustathius of Epiphania, chronicler, xii.7k(ix)*
- Eutharic, son of Theoderic, ix.18*
- Eutharius, bp of Tyana, 7.8o, ix.21c
- Eutropius, tribune, vii.10c*
- Eutyches, archimandrite, deposed at synod in Constantinople, 46, 49, 53, 69, ii.0d, 2a-d
- heresy of, 18, 22–3, 29, iii.1f, iv.12gg, v.1b, 4bf, 7cd, 8b*, 10b, vi.5c, ix.9a
- restored at Council of Ephesus (449), ii.3
- mentioned, iii.1ab, 9b*, 10b, iv.5c, 6b*, 8a*, iv.12g*k*m*, v.8bc, vi.2b, 6b, ix.9a, 15d, 19d*, 20, 21c, 26f
- Eutychian, bp of Dara, vii.6cfg
- Eutychians, seek approval of patriarch Theodosius, iii.9b
- plot against Timothy Aelurus, v.0b, 4a
- mentioned, 18, iv.0b, 12a, v.2a*, vii.8gh, ix.13f, 19d, x.5*
- Evagrius, church historian, 19, 24–8, 47, 51
- Evagrius, holy man, 7–8, 17
- Ezekiel, OT prophet, ix.25a

- Faige*, Persian infantry, ix.3
 Farzman, general, raids against
 Persians, vii.3a
 concludes treaty with Persians,
 vii.5d
 governs Mesopotamia, vii.5e
 deposes Paul, bp of Edessa, viii.4a*
 negotiates with Persians, viii.5a
 Felicissimus, addressee of work of
 Severus, ix.13f
 Felicissimus, *dux*, vii.6b, ix.2a
 Felix, pope, 26, v.9b*, vi.6e, 7a, vii.1b,
 15
 Flavian amphitheatre, Rome, xi.16b*
 Flavian, bp of Antioch, succeeds to
 throne, vi.6d, 7a
 suspected by Philoxenus, vii.10a
 presides at Council of Sidon, vii.10b
 deposed, 70, vii.10c
 godfather of Vitalian, viii.1a
 mentioned, vi.6e, vii.0, 5e*, 15,
 viii.4a
 Flavian, bp of CP, 69, ii.0d, 2cd, 3, 4,
 iii.1be*
 Florentius, patrician, ii.2c*
Foederati, iv.1b
 Formula of Reunion (433), iii.1a*,
 v.8b*
 Forum of Constantine, CP, ix.14a*
 Fravitta, bp of CP, succeeds Acacius,
 vi.4d
 letter to Peter Mongus, 51, vi.0, 4d,
 5
 letter of Peter Mongus to, 51, vi.0,
 4e, 6, vii.1b
 dies, vi.4d
 Gabbula, viii.3a, 5d
 Gabriel, archangel, vii.3c
 Gabriel of Nisibis, doctor, xii.7p
 Gabriel of Sinjar, ix.19c
 Gad, tribe of, v.10a
 Gadana of Akharê, 54, 65, vii.5b
 Gadar the Qadishite, ix.0b, 5
 Gaïanus, Julianist bp of Alexandria,
 ix.16a*, 19b
 Galatia, x.9
 Galatians, letter of Paul to, ix.13d
 Gallus, emperor, 40
 Gamaliel, relics of, i.0
 Gam'wa, village, x.12
 Gangra, place of exile of Dioscorus,
 iii.0, 1fk*, 2a, 11a
 place of exile of Timothy Aelurus,
 iv.0c, 7a, 9b, 11a, v.0a
 place of exile of Philoxenus, viii.5ad
 Gaul, x.9
 Gaza, 4, 9, iii.4b, 7a, v.4d, vii.10d,
 x.1d*
 Gaza school, 4
 Gehenna, fire of, iv.6a, ix.26b
 Geiseric, Vandal king, 41–2, ii.5, ix.17b
 Gelasius, pope, vi.7a*
 Gelimer, Vandal king, ix.17b*c*
 Gemellinus of Perîn (Perrhê), 47, x.0,
 4a
 Genesis, OT book of, 46, i.0, i.1j, i.2,
 ix.13d
 Gennadius, bp, v.3a
 Gennadius, bp of CP, disputes with
 Timothy Wobblecap, iv.10d
 dislikes Timothy Aelurus, iv.11a
 loses support, iv.11b
 suggests calling Mary 'Birthgiver of
 God', iv.11c*
 mentioned, iv.8a*, 12mm, vi.6a
 Gennadius, bp of Hermopolis Parva,
 v.6e*
 Gennadius, deacon, iv.12ff
 George, Arian bp of Alexandria, iv.2a
 Gessius, iatrosophist, 14
 Ghassanids, see Jafnids
 Gideon, OT leader, i.1d
 Gilgal, OT place, i.1c
 Glon, see Aglon
 Goliath, v.11a

- Goths, 72, iv.1b*, viii.2a, ix.18*
- Great Church, Alexandria, iv.1ac, 9a, v.4c, 5c, vi.1c*
- Great Church, Antioch, vii.10d*
- Great Church, CP, see Hagia Sophia
- Great Church of Forty Martyrs, Amida, vii.4d
- Green Faction, ix.14a*
- Gregory, bp of Antioch, x.1a*
- Gregory, bp of Nyssa, cited, iv.12o mentioned, ii.2a, vii.12a
- Gregory of Nazianzus, cited, 13, iv.12p, ix.21b, 25c mentioned, ii.2a, vii.12a
- Gregory of Nyssa (fifth century), iv.11c
- Gregory of Tours, ii.1
- Gregory the Illuminator, *catholicos*, xii.7k(i)
- Gregory the Wonderworker, cited, iv.12lm
- Gumathena, district, xii.6
- Gurzan (Georgia), xii.7k(ii)
- Habakkuk, OT prophet, ix.22cd
- Habbib, son of Gamaliel, bones of, i.o
- Hadrian, chiliarch, ix.8
- Hagar, wife of Abraham, OT, x.16b
- Hagia Sophia, CP, vii.8b*, 9*, viii.1b*, ix.14b
- Hamath, city, ix.8
- Hamimtha, village, xii.6
- (Mar) Hanina monastery, viii.5d
- Hananya, holy man, viii.5c
- Harith, Jafnid king, x.12*
- Harith, king of Najran, viii.3b*de
- Harmasha, place, viii.5d
- Harus, Caucasian people, xii.7k(xi)
- Harzem, vii.5a, see also Arzamon
- Hebdomon, vii.8b
- Helena, mother of Constantine, i.7
- Helenianae baths, CP, viii.1a*
- Heliopolis, see Ba'albek
- Helladius, deacon, vi.1a, 2b, 4a
- Henoticon*, text of, v.8 mentioned, 22, 24, 29–30, 51, 70, v.0de, 6a*, 7bcd, 9a, 10b, 11, vi.0, 1a, 2bc, 4abc*, 6cd, vii.10d, 12c, viii.4a*, ix.21b, 25b, 26d
- Hephthalites, 68
- Heraclea, iii.1f*, vii.3b*
- Heraclius, emperor, 68
- Hermione, estate, ix.17c*
- Hermogenes, *magister officiorum*, ix.0b, 7, 17a
- Herod, NT king, viii.7a
- Heruls, ix.3*
- Hezekiah, OT king, ix.5*, x.15b
- Hiba, bp of Edessa, letter to Mari, ii.3, iii.1b
- deposed at Council of Ephesus (449), iii.1b
- at Council of Chalcedon, iii.1d
- Dioscorus rejects communion with, iii.1j
- rejected as a heretic, 71, vii.8o, ix.21c
- Hierapolis (Mabbugh), viii.5c*, x.1b
- Hierocles, geographer, xii.7b*
- Hierotheus, spurious author, vii.12a
- Hilary, pope, iv.12mm
- Hilderic, Vandal king, ix.17c*
- Himyar, viii.3
- Himyarites, viii.0, 3
- Hira, see Hirta de-Nu'man
- Hirta de-Nu'man, viii.3ad
- Homs, see Emesa
- Honorius, emperor, 67
- Hormisdas, palace of, CP, 71, ix.15j*, x.5*
- Hormisdas, pope, 70, vii.12d, 15, viii.6
- Hormizd, *bdeashkh*, ix.5*, 6a
- Hosea, OT king, x.15b*
- Huns, iii.1d*, vii.3a, 12a*, viii.5af, ix.3, 6c, 7a, x.15a*, xii.7k(v), (x)*, 7mn
- Hypatia, Christian convert, xii.4a

- Hypatia, philosopher, xii.4a*
- Hypatius, bp of Ephesus, ix.15a*f*
- Hypatius, general, arrives in East,
vii.4g
attacks Nisibis, vii.5a
mistreats Vitalian's wife, vii.8f*
captured by Vitalian, vii.0, 13c
fails to succeed Anastasius, viii.1a*
sent to negotiate with Persians,
viii.5a
gets eastern command, ix.2a*
killed after Nika riot, ix.0b, 14
- Hypostasis*, iii.1f, iv.6c, 12kddgg,
v.11a, vi.2b, ix.15d*egh, 21b,
22b
- Ibas, see Hiba
- Iberia (Georgia), iii.4a*, see also
Gurzan
- Ibn Abi Usaibi'a, ix.19c*
- Idriphthon, fortress, ix.2a
- Ignatius, abbot, viii.5c
- Ignatius, bp of Antioch, vii.12a
- Ilium (Troy), x.15b
- Illus, general, 42, 67, v.1a*, 6f, 8a*,
9c, vi.6e
- Illyricum, viii.1a, ix.1a
- Ilmarqios, vii.12d*
- India, iv.12ll
- Ingilene, xii.6
- Innocentius, bp of Maroneia, ix.15a*f*
- Iotabe, island, 67
- Iran, vii.6c*
- Irenaeus, bp of Lyons, vii.12a
- Irenaeus, bp of Tyre, ii.3*, ix.21c
- St Irene, church, CP, v.1a
- Isaac of Bet 'Ebedyeshu', viii.5c
- (Mar) Isaac of Gabbula, monastery of,
viii.5d
- Isaac, son of Abraham (OT), ix.13d
- Isaac, Syriac teacher, 42, 48, 50, 52,
i.0, 1k, 9
- Isaiah, ascetic monk, 7, 9, 13–14, 17,
22–3, 25, 30, v.9b, vi.0, 2a*, 3
- Isaiah, OT prophet, vi.3b, ix.20
- Isaiah, rebel bp, vi.2c*
- Isḥaq bar Bar'ai, consul, vii.4e
- Israel, viii.7a, ix.23c, 25a, x.4cf, 15b*
- Israelites, i.1d, ix.8*, 23c
- Isaiah, bp of Hermopolis, iii.10a*,
iv.0bc, 12ahhj
- Isauria, vii.2
- Isaurians, 67–8, vii.0, 1a*, 2
- Isidore, bp of Chalcis, viii.5b*
- Italy, 55, 67, 72, vii.8c*, 12d, ix.18*,
x.1a, 15b
- Itimaroi, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)*
- Iustiniana Prima, see Prima Iustiniana
- Izla mountains, viii.5c, x.12, xii.6
- Jacob, OT patriarch, ix.20
- Jacob Baradaeus, 71, x.0, 12, xii.6*
- Jacob of Edessa, author, 36, 41, 43–5,
48, 50, xii.7a*
- Jacob of Serug, author, i.7, ii.1, vii.2,
viii.4a*, 5b*c*d*
- Jafnids, ix.2b, 6b, 8*
- Jairus, daughter of (NT), iv.12ee
- James, apostle, vii.14a
- James, author NT letter, ix.12b, 13bcd
- James, monk, iv.12ll, v.0a, 1a
- Jazira, see Mesopotamia, Upper
- Jebel Sinjar, x.1b*
- Jeremiah, OT prophet, ix.26a
- Jerusalem, mentioned, 8, 41–2, ii.4,
5, iii.0ab, 3a, 3cd, 4a*, 5, iv.9b,
v.1a*, 5a, 11b, vi.7a, vii.0, 5c,
13c*, 14a, viii.0, 4ac, ix.17c*,
x.4c, 16b, xii.7a
- Jerusalem, patriarchate of, 44, iii.1a,
3c, iv.12mm, vi.1a, 6e, vii.15
- Jews, as term of reproach, vii.8k,
ix.23b
mentioned, i.7, viii.3b–g, 7a, ix.0b,
4, xii.7a*
- Job, OT figure, ix.16g, 22c

- Jobias, supposed daughter of Shapur I, ix.6d*
- John, abbot at Amida, xii.6
- John, abbot of Kafra de Birta, viii.5c
- John Accudaeus, iii.1f*
- John, Alexandrian priest, vi.1a, 2b, 4ae
- John, Amidene, xii.6
- John bar Aphthonia, viii.5bc, ix.15a*j
- John bar Hablâhâ, governor, vii.4f
- John, bp of Aegae, ii.3, vii.8o*, ix.21c
- John II, bp of Alexandria, vi.6d, vii.15
- John III, bp of Alexandria, vi.6d, vii.9*, 10d, 12c, 15
- John, bp of Amida, vii.3c
- John, bp of Antioch, ii.2a
- John, bp of Bizye, ix.15a*
- John, bp of Constantia (Tella), viii.5bd*e, ix.15a*j*, 19c*, x.1b, 4a*, 12*
- John II, bp of CP, 55, vii.0, 14a, 15, viii.1b*c
- John, bp of Ephesus, iv.0bc, 5a, 12mm, v.0b
- John, bp of Ephesus, historian, 28, 32–5, 37–8, 44, 47–8, 54, 56, viii.3f*, 5c*
- John, bp of Germanicia, iii.1e, vii.8o
- John, bp of Jerusalem, vii.10d, 15, viii.6
- John, bp of Magilis, vi.1a*c*
- John, bp of Neapolis, ix.8*
- John, bp of Sebennytyos, 13, vi.1a*, 2b*, 4c*
- John, brother of Donatus/Dith, vii.5e*
- John, brother of Ephraem, bp of Antioch, viii.4d*
- John, chief of *silentiarii*, iii.1f, 11
- John Codonatus, bp of Antioch, v.9c*
- John, deacon of Amida, vii.6c
- John Diakrinomenos, church historian, 30, 54
- John, Egyptian, vi.1a, 2b, 4a
- John, eunuch, iii.4a
- John, evangelist, 50, iv.12jj, v.3b
- John, general (fifth century), 41, ii.5
- John, general (sixth century), viii.3a*
- John Chrysostom, bp of CP, cited, iv.12rst
- mentioned, 41, ii.5
- John Comentiolus, xii.6*
- John, heretic, ix.21c
- John Malalas, see Malalas
- John, monk of monastery of Easterners, viii.5c
- John of Bet Aphtonion, viii.5b*, 455
- (Mar) John of Haura, monastery of, viii.5d
- John of Litarba, 48
- John ‘of Penephusus’, vi.1a*
- John of Resh‘aina, xii.7k(i)*, 1
- John of the Urtayê, monastery of, vii.4a, viii.5c, xii.6*
- John II, pope, ix.18*
- John Rufus, author, 8, 11, 25, 40
- John, *scholasticus*, vii.1a
- John, *silentiarius*, iii.0b
- John, soldier turned priest, vii.6f
- John Talaia, bp of Alexandria, visits CP, v.0d, 6ef
- succeeds Timothy Wobblecap, v.7ab
- flees Egypt, v.7c
- links with Illus, v.8c*
- visits Rome, 26, 28, v.0e, 9b
- mentioned, 29, vi.7a, 455
- John the Baptist, church at Alexandria, v.6e
- head of, 8, 49, x.9
- John the Canopite, 8
- John the Cappadocian, praetorian prefect, ix.14a, 17b*c*
- John the Fuller, pagan, 7
- John the Grammarian, vii.10e*
- John the Hesychast, v.7b*
- John the Rhetor, heretic, iii.0b, 9b, 10
- John, tribune, iii.1cd, 3b
- Jonathan, OT figure, x.4f

- Jordan, river, i.1c, v.10a, vii.14a
- Joseph, OT patriarch, 46, 48, 53–4, i.4–6
- Joseph, Persian *catholicos*, xii.7p
- Joseph, pessimistic author, 57
- Josephus, historian, vii.5c
- Joshua Bar Nun (OT), v.10c, ix.23a
- Jotham, king of Judah (OT), x.15b
- Jovian, emperor, iii.9a*
- Judaism, ix.13d
- Judah, tribe of, ix.23a
- Judas, apostle, iii.2a
- Judges, OT book of, ix.23a
- Julian, Alexandrian priest, vi.1a, 2b, 4ac*e
- Julian, bp of Cos, iii.1e*
- Julian, bp of Halicarnassus, corresponds with Severus, 47, 52, ix.0b, 10–13, 16efg
- heresy discussed, ix.9
- doctrines of, 53, ix.15d*, 21b*
- mentioned, 10, 16, 52, iii.10a*, iv.12l*, vii.7b*, 8b*, 10e, viii.5d, ix.16a
- Julian, Samaritan leader, ix.8*
- Julius, general, see Illus
- Julius, pope, cited, iv.12jkq
- mentioned, ii.2a, vii.12a
- Julius Nepos, emperor, iv.5a*
- Justin I, emperor, serves in the East, vii.4g, 14b
- succeeds to throne, 10, 70, vii.8i*1*, 14b, viii.1a
- sends envoys to Kavadh, viii.5a
- admonished by Barnikinâ, viii.5d
- dies, viii.6a, ix.0a
- mentioned for dating, 31, 69, vii.3a*, 15, viii.0, 2a, 4a, 5b, 6, ix.1a, 2a, 15a*, xii.7j
- mentioned, 54
- Justin II, emperor, 32, 66, 72, viii.1a*
- Justinian I, emperor, allows Miaphysites to return to monasteries, viii.5f
- succeeds to throne, 43, viii.6, ix.0a, 1a
- legislates against Manichaeans, 19
- makes peace with Persians, 71–2, ix.7
- crushes Nika riot, ix.14b
- receives Miaphysite bps in CP, ix.0b, 15
- receives letter of Severus, ix.16a
- orders conquest of Italy, ix.18
- receives Severus in CP, ix.19a
- receives pope Agapetus in CP, ix.19d
- relieved by failure of Dara coup, x.1c
- informed of *acheiropoiêtos* icon, xii.4b
- mentioned for dating, 51, 55–6, 60ix.0a, x.0, 6a, 15a, xii.4b, 5b
- mentioned, 40, 50, 65–6, 70, vii.3a*, x.9
- Justus, guard, x.0
- Juvenal, bp of Jerusalem, presides at Council of Ephesus (449), ii.3
- at Council of Chalcedon, iii.0b, 1dek*, 3
- returns to Palestine, iii.5
- abused by Solomon, iii.8a
- mentioned, 29, 45, ii.0d, 2a, 4, iv.12mm
- Kafra de Birta, monastery, viii.5c
- Kama, river, xii.7k(ix)*
- Kanarak the Lame, vii.4ab
- Kanarang*, title, vii.4a*
- Kashwai, doctor, xii.7p
- Kavadh, Persian king, issues ultimatum to Anastasius, vii.3a
- captures Theodosiopolis, vii.3b
- besieges Amida, vii.3c–4f, 14b
- sells deportees to Huns, xii.7l
- invades Roman territory again, vii.5a

- tries to destroy Dara, vii.6e
- demands payments from Romans, viii.5a
- entrusts Gadar with an army, ix.5
- orders capture of Martyropolis, ix.6a
- dies, ix.6b
- mentioned, 71, ix.6d, 7
- Kefra d-bârtâ, village, viii.5c*
- Kfar Gamla, village, i.8
- Khabur, river, viii.5ac*, x.0
- Khasir, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
- Khazars, xii.7k(ix)*
- Kholiatat, see Khulas
- Khulas, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
- Khusro I, Persian king, succeeds to throne, ix.6d
- makes peace with Romans, ix.7
- invades Roman East in 540, 72, vii.6g, x.0, 1b, 5, 6a
- captures Callinicum, x.0, 6b
- besieges Edessa, x.0, 10b
- captures Lazica, x.0
- respect for Christian doctors, xii.7p
- builds hospital, xii.7q
- mentioned, 54, 66, 71, ix.17c
- Khusro II, Persian king, 68
- Khwarazmians, xii.7k(ix)*
- Kolch, see Khulas
- Korthrigor, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
- Kotzirs, see Khasir
- Kush (Ethiopia) x.9
- Kuth, city, ix.8
- Kutrigur, see Korthrigor
- Labdon, OT judge, x.15b
- Laodicea, Council of, vii.10c*
- Latins, x.15b
- Laurentian Schism, vii.12d*
- Lazica, 72, iii.4c*, ix.7b*, x.0, x.13a
- Lebanon, viii.4c
- Leo I, emperor, succeeds to throne, iii.11b, 12, iv.5a
- receives letter from Timothy Aelurus, 25, iv.6
- receives letter from Anatolius, iv.8a
- receives letters from pope Leo, 25, iv.0ac
- circulates Encyclical, iv.0bc, 5a
- receives replies about Encyclical, iv.7a
- receives letter from Anatolius, iv.8a
- receives letters from Proterius' supporters, iv.9a*
- forbids Timothy Wobblecap to honour Dioscorus, iv.10d
- orders Mary proclaimed 'Birthgiver of God', iv.11c
- dies, iv.12lmm, v.1a
- mentioned for dating, iv.0ad, 1a, 12mm, v.1a
- mentioned, 23, 53, 67
- Leo II, emperor, iii.0b, 12b*, iv.0cd, iv.1a, v.1a*
- Leo, pope, cited, ix.15h
- correspondence with Eutyches, ii.2d
- bribed by Theodoret, iii.1b
- writes to Eudocia, iii.5a*
- receives mission from Alexandria, iv.0ac, 3b, 4a
- correspondence with emperor Leo, iv.5a
- criticised by Timothy Aelurus, iv.6
- criticises Timothy Aelurus, iv.7a
- representatives of, ii.3, iii.1d
- mentioned, 69, ii.4, iii.1j
- See also Tome of Leo
- (St) Leontius of Tripolis, 16
- Leontius, bp of Ascelon, iii.3c
- Leontius, city councillor, vii.4af
- Leontius, law professor, 7
- Leontius, usurper, 42, 67, v.6f, v.9c, vi.6e
- Lesbos, island, 11
- Letter of the Alexandrians, unknown work, iv.6d

- Letter to the Monks of Senun*, work of
Philoxenus, vii.12d*
- Levi, tribe of, ix.16d
- Libanius, rhetor, 6
- Libelarius, general, viii.4a*, ix.1b*,
ix.2b*
- Liberarius, general, viii.4ab, ix.2b*,
ix.6d
- Liberatus, church historian, 20
- Liberius, general, 72, ix.18*
- Libius Severus, emperor, iii.0b, 11b,
12a, iv.0a, 5a
- Libya, v.8a, x.9
- Lingis/Lilingis, Isaurian leader, vii.2*
- Litarbae, village, viii.5c*
- Longinus, abbot, iv.1b
- Longinus, bp of Nobades, iii.9a*,
iv.1a*
- Longinus, brother of emperor Zeno,
vii.2*
- Longinus of Cardala, vii.2*
- Longinus of Selinus, vii.2*
- Longinus, priest, vi.5d, 5d, vii.1b
- Lucentius, bp of Asculum, 3.1e*
- Lucian (Loukianos), hagiographer, 49,
i.8
- Lycia, xii.7b
- Mabbugh, see Hierapolis
- Macarius, Armenian bp, xii.7m*, o
- Macedonius, bp of CP, succeeds to
throne, vii.1b
deposed, 10, 50, vii.0, 7–8, ix.9a*
florilegium of, 454–6
mentioned, 58, 65, vii.15, ix.10b*
- Macedonius, heresiarch, ix.21c
- Ma'dayê, Arab tribe, viii.3a
- Magians, xii.7p
- Magna, wife of Pompey, 455
- Magus, monastery of, viii.5c
- Maipherqaṭ, see Martyropolis
- Maiuma, 4–5, 7, 9, iii.4b, vii.10d*
- Majorian, emperor, iii.11b, 12b, iv.0a
- Maka, mother of Ephraem, bp of
Antioch, viii.4d
- Malalas, chronicler, 34, 56–7, i.7,
x.15b*
- Mamona, bp of Neapolis, ix.8
- Manasseh, tribe of, i.1a, v.10a
- Mani, heresiarch, iii.9b, ix.9a*, ix.15d,
16e
- Manichaeans(s), vii.7b, 8gh
- Manichaeans, heresy of, 10, 18–19,
iii.1i, ix.16e
- Mar ..., see under the name of the
person or monastery
- Mara, bp of Amida, 37–8, 50–2, viii.0,
5b, 7, ix.0b
- Marcellinus *comes*, chronicler, 41–2,
49
- Marcian, archimandrite, iii.3d
- Marcian, emperor, convenes Council of
Chalcedon, ii.4, 5, iii.1d
at Council of Chalcedon, 51, iii.0b,
1k, 3c
receives letter from pope Leo, iii.1b
summons Nestorius, iii.1c
gives orders for Egypt, iii.2a
expels Miaphysites in Palestine,
iii.5a
orders capture of bishop
Theodosius, iii.9a
orders Alexandrians to accept
Proterius, iii.11a
dies, iii.11b, iv.0a, 1a, 5a
mentioned for dating, ii.5, iii.0a, 1a,
12b, iv.7a, v.2e*
mentioned, 23, 67, ix.15i
- Marcian, monk, v.6a
- Marcianus of Heraclea, xii.7a*
- Marcion, heresiarch, iii.9b, ix.9a*,
ix.21c
- Marcus Aurelius, emperor, x.16b*
- Marcus, son of Basiliscus, 42,
iv.12mm, v.0a, 2ae, 3a, vi.6e,
vii.2

- Mari, see Hiba, letter to
 Mari, chaste man, viii.5d
 Marinus of Apamea, praetorian prefect, 56, vii.9, viii.1a
 Mark, evangelist, iv.1a, ix.26b
 Maron, monk, viii.5c
 Martin, general, ix.17c, x.0
Martyrium Arethae, viii.3a*
 Martyrius, bp of Antioch, iv.11c, 12mm, vii.8a*
 Martyrius, bp of Jerusalem, accepts *Henoticon*, 29, v.0e
 his speech, 51, v.6, v.8b*
 his letter to Peter Mongus, v.12
 mentioned, v.5a, 8a*, vi.6e, 7a
 Martyrius, quaestor, v.5a*
 Martyropolis, captured by Kavadh, vii.3b*
 base of *dux* Bessas, ix.5
 Persians attack, ix.0, 6a
 Huns attack, ix.0, 6c
 mentioned, 56, x.1c*
 Marutha, bp of Martyropolis, ix.6d*
 Marutha, sister of Mara, 37, viii.5b
 Masruq, see Dhu Nuwas
 Matrona, monastery of, CP, vii.8j*
 Mauriana, see Castra Mauriana
 Maximianus, bp of CP, ii.4, iii.1c*
 Maximus, bp of Antioch, ii.4, iv.12mm
 Mediterranean sea, ix.17c*
 Mehmet the Conqueror, vii.4c*
 Melabasa, ix.5
 Melkite chronicle, 57
 Menas, ascetic, 6
 Menas, bp of CP, ix.19e
 Menuthis, pagan shrine at, 5–6, 14
 Mermeroes, general, ix.6a*
 Mesopotamia, province, vii.10d, 12c, viii.3a*, 5b*c, ix.2b*, 5*, x.9
 Mesopotamia, Lower, ix.1b*
 Mesopotamia, Upper, 61, vii.2, 3ac, x.6b, xii.6
 Methodius, bp of Olympus, 50, i.1g
 Micah, OT prophet, i.1e
 Michael the Syrian, chronicler, 19, 24–5, 39, 45, 47–8, 57–60
 Midianites, i.1d
 Mihr Girowi, general, ix.6a
 Minduos, village, ix.2b*
 Misael, *cubicularius*, 3, 9–10, 13
 Mithridatos, see John, eunuch
 Moabitis, iii.5a*
 Monastery of, see under the name of the monastery
 Moors, ix.17b
 Morian, see Majorian
 Moses, OT prophet, i.1b, v.10a, viii.7b, ix.13c, 16ad, 26a, x.4c, xii.5a
 (Pseudo-)Moses Khorenats'i, xii.7b*
 Moses (Mushe) of Aggel (Ingilene), translator, 46, i.6
 Moses of Tarmel monastery, ix.6d, 7b
 Mundhir, king, 58, viii.0, 3ad, 5a, ix.4*, 8*
 Mundus, general, ix.14b
 Mygdonius, river, viii.5d*
 Mytilene, 11
 Nabarnugius, see Peter the Iberian
 Nahash the Ammonite, ix.23c
 Najran, city, viii.3bd
 Najran, martyrs of, 50, viii.0, 3
 Naples, ix.0b, 18, x.13b*
 Narses, general, 72, ix.14b*, ix.22d*
 Naṭpa, monastery of, viii.5d
 Nazarenes, vii.4e, ix.4
 Neapolis, Palestine, iii.5b, ix.8
 Neo-Chalcedonians, ix.20*
 Nephalius, agitator, 10, 18, 22, vi.1c, 2ab, 4c*
 Nestorians (Chalcedonians), 22, iii.9ab, iv.7a, 11b, vii.8j, viii.4a
 Nestorius, bp of CP, recalled from exile, iii.1a, 3b
 cited, iv.12cc*, ix.15h

- heresy of, 23, iii.1ac-fk, 3b, 9,
iv.6bc, 9b, 12agg, v.1b, 4f, 6a,
7cd, 9c, 10b, vi.4d, 5c, ix.15e,
19d, 25b, 26f
mentioned, 68, ii.2a, 2d, 3, iii.1bd,
v.2b, 5c, 8bc, vi.2b, 4e, vi.6b,
vii.7a, 8bln*o, vii.10b, viii.1c,
ix.15ci, 20, 21bc, 22c, 26d, 454
Nicaea, iii.1d, vii.2*
Nicaea, Council of (325), iv.1a*, 6bcd,
12c*, v.2a*bc, 3b, 5c, 6cd, 7c,
8ab, 10b, vi.2b, vii.8h, 11a,
viii.5b*, ix.15ci, 21b, 22ac, 25b,
26d
Nicephorus, author of *Chronogra-
pheion syntomon*, 40, 44–5
Nicodemus, relics of, i.o
Nika riot, 70, ix.0b, 14
Nisibis, city, hard for Romans to
capture, vii.6a
Romans raid, viii.5a
battle at, ix.0b, 1
mentioned, vii.5a*, viii.5c*d*,
ix.2a, 3, 19c*
Nonnus, bp of Amida, vii.5e*, viii.5b,
ix.6a
Nonnus, bp of Circesium, viii.5d*,
ix.15a*
Nonnus, bp of Martyropolis, viii.5b
Notitia Galliarum, xii.7b*
Notitia Urbis Constantinopolitanae,
x.16*
Notitia Urbis Romae, x.16*
Novatians, v.4d*
Nubia, vi.2a*
Nymphius, river, ix.5*
Oasis, Egypt, ii.2a, iii.1c, v.2e*, vi.4e,
vii.7b, 8n*, 455
Odoacer, ruler of Italy, 42, v.8a*, vi.6e,
ix.18*
Ogur, xii.7k(ix)
Olba, vii.2*
Olybrius, emperor, iii.0b, 11b, 12,
iv.0a, iv.5a
Olympiad, see Introduction C (3)(ii)
Onogur, xii.7k(ix)
‘Ophrah, village, i.1d
Opilio, diplomat, ix.18*
Orientals, monastery of, see Easterners,
monastery of
Origen, teaching of, 49–50, ix.19c
Osrhoene, province, vii.9c, viii.5c,
ix.2*, 4*, x.9
Palestine, 5, 8, 10, 18, 69, iii.0b, 3,
4a, 10b, iv.1a, 5a, 9a, 12hh*,
v.5b*, 6a*, 2c*, 3a, vii.8a*, 10e,
viii.4c*, 5c*, ix.8, x.1d, 9
Palladius, bp of Antioch, vi.4f*, 6de*,
7a
Palladius, sophist, iii.10ab*
Pamprepius, rebel, v.6f, 8a*, 9c, vi.6e
Pamphylia, xii.7b*
Paphlagonia, iii.0a*, v.5b
Paphnutius, deacon of Amida, vii.6c
Paphnutius, dedicatee of translation of
Cyril, 46
Pappus of Alexandria, xii.7a*
Paralius, Christian convert, 5, 8, 14,
16–17
Partaw (Albania), xii.7k(iii)*
Pascasius, deacon, vii.7b, 8cj, 454
Paschasinus, bp of Lilybaeum, iii.e*
Passover, ix.4*
Patricius, general, arrives in the East,
vii.4g
raids Arzanene, vii.5a
receives *libellus* against
Macedonius, vii.8b
criticises Macedonius, vii.8i
mentioned, iv.5a*
Paul, apostle, iii.1hi, iv.12hhjj, vi.6b,
vii.8l, ix.12b, 13bcd, 15e*, 20,
22ab, 24a, 26abef, x.4cd
Paul ‘Arcadius’, 5.9b

- Paul, bp of Edessa, viii.4a, x.4a*
- Paul, bp of Najran, viii.3b
- Paul, *notarius*, viii.0, 2
- Paul of Callinicum, translator, 47, ix.10*
- Paul of Samosata, heresiarch, ii.2a, iii.9b, ix.21c
- Paul, patrician, vii.8b*
- Paul, steward at Amida, vii.4af
- Paul 'the Jew', bp of Antioch, viii.1c, 4a*d, 6, ix.23b*
- Paul the Tabennesiote, bp of Alexandria, x.1bd
- paygân*, see *faige*
- Pentapolis, v.7b, 8a
- Pergamius, *augustalis*, v.7bcd, 9a, 11b
- Peroz, Persian king, vii.3a
- Perrhê, x.4a
- Persarmenia, ix.6b*, x.0, 10a, xii.7k(i)-(iii)
- Persia, 70, ix.5, x.0, 1b, xii.7k(ii)(iii)
- Persians, 68, 72, v.8a, vii.0, 3, 5bd, 6ab, viii.3a, ix.0b, 2b, 3–5, 6ac, 7a, 8, 17ac, x.9, 12, 13a, xii.7k(ix)*
- Pesilta monastery, viii.5c, x.12
- Peter, apostle, iii.11, iv.12chh, v.10a, x.4g
- Peter, bp of Apamea, 11, viii.5b, ix.19a*
- Peter, bp of Jerusalem, vii.15, viii.6, ix.19b
- Peter, bp of Resh'aina, viii.5b, ix.15a*, 19c
- Peter, bp of Titopolis, vi.6d*
- Peter Mongus, bp of Alexandria, succeeds Timothy Aelurus, v.5a
author of anti-Chalcedonian works, 53, iv.6d
sought by Timothy Wobblecap, v.0c, 5c
restored to see by emperor Zeno, v.7b
accepts *Henoticon*, v.0d, 7cde
remains in communion with separatists, v.9
- receives letters from Acacius and Martyrius, 26, 51, v.0e, 11–12
expels schismatics, v.0e, vi.1c
destroys pagan shrine at Menuthis, 5
accused by Nephalius, 18, vi.2a
loses support, vi.2bc
tries to enforce *Henoticon*, vi.4ab
receives letter from Fravitta, 51, vi.5a
threatens Euphemius, vi.4e
writes to Fravitta, 51, vi.4d, 6
threatened by Euphemius, vii.1b
dies, vi.4ef
mentioned, 22, 24, 29, 70, v.5b, 7a, 8a*, vi.7a
- Peter, monk, vi.0
- Peter of 'Amkhoru, vii.4d
- Peter the Fuller, bp of Antioch, replaces Martyrius, iv.11c*
signs *Encyclicon*, v.2e
deposed, v.5a
returns to see, v.0e, 9c
letter to Peter Mongus, 51, v.10
letter to Martyrius, vi.6d*
favours addition to Trisagion, vii.7b*
mentioned, 31, iv.12mm, vi.7a
- Peter the Iberian, consecrated bp of Gaza, 5, iii.0b, 4ab
spared by Marcian from expulsion, iii.5a
divine vision of, iii.7a
condemns John the Rhetor, iii.10b
consecrates Timothy Aelurus, iv.1a
in communion with Timothy Aelurus, v.4d
in communion with Peter Mongus, v.9b
investigates Peter Mongus, vi.1c
summoned to CP, 14, vii.2a*, 3a
Zachariah's biography of, 7, 9, 13–14
mentioned, 22–3, 25, vi.2b*

- Peter the Patrician, *magister officiorum*, xii.6
- Petra (Arabia), 37, vii.10c*, viii.5b
- Petra (Lazica), x.13a
- Petrova Gora, ix.1a*
- Pharaoh, OT king, 48, ix.13c
- Pharas, general, ix.3*
- Pharesmanes, see Farzman
- Pheidias, sculptor, i.lg
- Philalêthês*, work of Severus, vii.10d, ix.9a*, 454–6
- Philip, apostle, iv.1a
- Philip, brother of Procopius of Gaza, 9
- Philippopolis, viii.5a*
- Philoponoi, 5, 15
- Philostorgius, church historian, 21
- Philoxenus, bp of Dulichium, ix.15a*
- Philoxenus, bp of Hierapolis, supports Peter the Fuller, v.9c*
- contact with emperor Zeno, vii.10a
- writes to emperor Anastasius, vii.8o, 10a
- visits CP, 10
- initiates Council of Sidon, vii.10b*
- has Flavian deposed, 70, vii.10c
- at Council of Tyre, vii.10d*, 12c
- orthodoxy of, vii.12b
- writes letter to monks of Senun, vii.12d
- exiled to Gangra, viii.5a
- mentioned, 53, ii.2a*, 5, iv.6d, vii.0, 12a, viii.3b*, 5c*, 5d, ix.13e
- Phine(h)as, OT priest, i.1c
- Phoenice Libanensis, province, v.10a, vii.10d, 12c
- Phoenicia, iii.1e*, iv.9a, x.9
- Photinus, heresiarch, ix.21c
- Pityus, v.5a*
- Plague (Justinianic), 72, x.9, 13b
- Plato, city prefect, CP, vii.8d*
- Plato, philosopher, 13
- Polemios Silvius, x.16b*, xii.7b*
- Polycarp, *chorepiskopos*, 46
- Pompey, nephew of Anastasius, viii.1a*, ix.0b, 14
- praetorium, CP, vii.8j
- Prima Iustiniana, city, ix.1a*
- Priscus of Panium, historian, xii.7k(ix)*
- Probus, nephew of Anastasius, vii.10d, viii.1a*, xii.7l*, n
- Proclus, bp of CP, 47, 51–2, ii.2a, 4, 5
- Procopius of Caesarea, historian, 4, 6, 54–5
- Procopius of Gaza, author, 4, 8, 10
- Prologue of Mara, viii.0, 7a
- Proterius, bp of Alexandria, succeeds Dioscorus, iii.0a, 2a, iv.0a
- bribes soldiers, iii.2b
- hated by Alexandrians, iii.10a
- seizes Quirinian church, iv.1c
- killed, 25, 30, iv.0ac, 2a, 4a, 10c
- mentioned for dating, iii.10ab*, iv.3a, 12mm
- supporters of, iv.1a, 3b, 5c, 9a, 10a, v.0b, 4c, 7bd
- mentioned, 23
- Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre, chronicler, 28, 33–5, 37, 43–4, 47, 54, 56, ii.1
- Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, vii.12a, ix.15f, 19c
- Pseudo-Joshua the Stylite, historian, 34–5
- Pseudo-Zachariah, life of, 32–3
- sources used, 39–57
- style of, 60–2
- transmission of, 57–60
- work of, 33–8
- Ptolemy, geographer, 50–1, 61, xii.7a*
- Ptolemy Philadelphus, king, xii.7a
- Ptolemy Philometor, king, xii.7abj
- Pulcheria, empress, receives letter from pope Leo, iii.1b
- at Council of Chalcedon, iii.1k
- mentioned, iii.0a, 4a*, 5a*
- Pygmies, xii.7k(x)

- Qadishite(s), ix.0b, 2c, 5
 Qardust, bp of Albania, xii.71*m
 Qartmin monastery, vii.3c, viii.5a*
 Qattare (*katharoi*) monastery, vii.5e
 Qenneshrê, viii.5bc
 Qenneshrin (Chalcis), vii.10b, 11a, viii.5d*, x.1b
 Qithariz, fortress, ix.6c
 Qohelet (OT), ix.16b, 22c
 Quirinian church, Alexandria, iv.1c, 2a*
 Quirites (Romans), x.15b*
 Qur'an, ii.1
 Qustant, governor, viii.5b
 Qutriga, criminal, vii.4ab
- Rabbula, bp of Edessa, 47, 52, x.0, 4a
 Rabshakeh, OT kg, ix.5
 Râmallâh (Ramla), viii.3a*d*
 Ramsha, viii.5d
 Red Giants, xii.7k(xi)*
 Red Sea, ix.16a
 Requm, monastery of, viii.5d
 Resh'aina (Theodosiopolis), 46, i.0, vii.6g, viii.5c*, ix.19c, x.1b
 Reuben, tribe of, i.1c, v.10a
 Rhodon, prefect, x.1d*
 Rhousios, see Red Giants
 Ricimer, general, 67, iii.12a
 Romans, iii.2a, 5b*, iv.1b, v.8a, vii.3a, 4g, 5abc*de*, 6a, 8i, viii.3a*, ix.1b, 2a, 3–6, 7a, 8, 17c, x.6a, 10a, 13ab*, xii.7k(ix)*
 Romanus, addressee of work of Severus, ix.13f
 Romanus, archimandrite of Tekoa, iii.3d, 9b*, v.9b, vii.10d*
 Romanus, monastery of, viii.5c
 Romanus, senator, vii.8c, viii.2b, 454
 Rome, depiction of Constantine's baptism in, 48, i.1j
 visited by Isaac, i.9
 Theoderic's building in, vii.12d, ix.18
 plundered by Vandals, ix.17b
- captured by Belisarius, ix.18
 sacked by Goths, x.15a
 buildings described, 50, 53–4, 59, 61, x.15b, 16
 mentioned, 28, 47, ii.4, iv.0ac, v.0e, v.9b, vi.6e, vii.15b, ix.0b, 19d*, x.0, 1a
 Rome, patriarchate of, iii.1a, iv.10d, 12mm, v.2b, vi.7a, vii.12d
 Romulus, x.15b
 Romulus Augustulus, emperor, 66, ix.18*
 Rotunda church, Antioch, x.5
 Rufinus, Roman ambassador, ix.0b, 7, 17a
 Rumi, queen, viii.3bc
 Rus, xii.7k(xi)*
- Saba of Amida, xii.6
 Sabas, holy man, ix.8*
 Sabirs, ix.6c*, xii.7k(ix), n*
 Sagus, standard-bearer, ix.3*
 Sallust, bp of Jerusalem, vi.4f*, 6e, vii.1b
 Salmon, fortress, iv.12mm, v.1a, vii.2
 Samaria, ix.8
 Samaritans, iii.0b, 5b, 6a, ix.0b, 8
 Samosata, viii.5d*, x.4a*
 Samqe, village, i.9b
 Samson, OT judge, x.15b
 Samuel, abbot, see Samuel, monk
 (Mar) Samuel, monastery of, viii.5c
 Samuel, monk, 50, vii.5e, 8a
 Saracens, iii.5a*
 Saraguri, see Sarurgur
 Sarah, wife of Abraham (OT), x.16b
 Sardinia, ix.17b*
 Sarmatia, xii.7k(ix)*
 Sarurgur, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)
 Saul, OT king, x.4f
 Sbide, vii.2*
 Schismatic monks of Alexandria, v.0e, 4d, 9a, vi.0, 1a

- Scythian monks, vii.8h*
 Scythopolis, ix.8*
 Secundinus, addressee of letter of
 Dioscorus, iii.1g
 Sefarwayim, city, ix.8
 Seleucia (ad Belum), viii.5b
 Seleucia Pieria, viii.5b*
 Sen'ar, land of (OT), i.1b
 Senate, iii.1kl
 Sennacherib, OT king, ix.5*
 Senun, monastery of, viii.5c
 Separatists, see Schismatic monks
 Serapion, deacon, vi.1a, 2b, 4a
 Serdica, 10
 Serdica, Council of (343), v.6c
 Sergius, abbot at Amida, xii.6
 Sergius, *archiatros*, ix.19c, x.1a
 Sergius bar Zabduni, governor, vii.4f
 Sergius, bp of Cyrrhus, viii.5d*,
 ix.15a*
 Sergius, deacon of Amida, vii.6c
 Sergius, nephew of Solomon, ix.18*
 Sergius of Pesilta, viii.5c
 Sergius, plain man, viii.5d
 Sergius, rebuilder of Sodqatha, viii.5d
 Sergius the Grammarian, vii.10e
 Lake Sevan, xii.7k(iv)*
Seven Questions of the Dyophysites,
 work of Severus, vii.10d
 Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, 38, 40, 49,
 57, ii.0c, 1
 Severian, bp of Scythopolis, iii.3c*
 Severus, bp of Antioch, relationship
 with Zachariah, 3–12
 favours addition to Trisagion,
 vii.7b*
 debates with Macedonius, vii.8b*
 succeeds Flavian, 16, vii.10d, 12a
 refutes Sergius the Grammarian,
 vii.10e
 dealings with Paul, bp of Edessa,
 viii.4a
 interprets the *Henoticon*, vii.12c
 flees Antioch, viii.1c
 hated by Vitalian, viii.2a
 corresponds with Julian of Halicar-
 nassus, 47, ix.0b, 10–13, 16efg
 refuses to come to CP, ix.15j
 writes to Justinian, ix.0b, 16
 visits Justinian in CP, ix.0b, 15k,
 19ad
 writes to eastern bishops, ix.0b, 20
 exchanges letters with Anthimus
 and Theodosius, 58, ix.0b, 19d,
 21–4
 expelled from CP, x.1a
 moderate towards converts v.4d*
 dies, x.12*
 literary works mentioned, 40, 53,
 59, iv.6d, 454–6
 Zachariah's biography of, 4, 15–18,
 25
 mentioned, 21, 29, 32, 54, 70,
 iii.0a*, v.5c*, vi.2c*, 6d*,
 vii.0, 8d*i*k*o*, 9*, 10b*, 15,
 viii.5ab*d*, ix.6d*, 15d*, 18*,
 19*, 26bc, x.5
 Severus, see also Libius Severus
 Shalmeneser V, king, ix.8
 Shechem, ix.20
 Sheol, iv.12c
 Shepherd's Fold, vii.5b
 Shmuni, sister of Mara, 37, viii.5b
 Siberia, xii.7k(ix)*
 Sicily, x.9
 Sidon, iii.9a
 Sidon, Council of (511/12), 42–3, 50,
 vii.0, 10ab, 11a
silentium, vii.8dh*k
 Siloam, viii.0, 4ac
 Silverius, pope, ix.18*, 19e
 Silvester, pope, 45, 48, 53, i.0, 1j, 7
 Simai, abbot, viii.5c
 Simas, chiliarch, ix.3
 Simeon, abbot of monastery at
 Gabbula, viii.3a, 5d

- Simeon, bp of Chalcis, viii.5d*
 Simeon of Bet Arsham, vii.8a*, viii.3a
 Simeon of Bet Arsham, Letter of, 43, 50, viii.3
 Simeon of Legina, 53, iv.6d, viii.5c
 Simeon of Qenneshrin, viii.5d
 Simeon, priest (NT), viii.7a, x.4f*
 Simeon, priest and author, 50, 58, vii.8ad*n*
 Simeon, recluse, viii.5d*
 Simeon 'the Horned', viii.5f
 Simeon, tribe of, ix.23a
 Simplicius, pope, 25, iv.10d*, 12mm*, v.7b*, 9bc, vi.6e, 7a
 Singara, x.0b
 Sisagan, xii.7k(iv)
 Sisak, xii.7k(iv)*
 Sisaurana, fortress, x.0
 Sittas, general, viii.5a*, ix.6b
 Siwnik*, see Sisagan
 Socrates, church historian, 20–1, 30, 34, 37, 40, 43, 45, 48, 51–2, 62, i.1ij, ii.0a, 2a, 5
 Sodqatha, viii.5d
 Solachon, ix.2b*
 Solomon, general, ix.2a, 18*
 Solomon, monk, iii.0b, 8a
 Solomon, monk of monastery of Mar Samuel, viii.5c
 Solomon, OT king, i.1a
 Solomon, priest, vi.6d
 Solomon, temple of (Ba'albek), viii.0, 4ac
 Sophanene, xii.6
 Sophia, empress, 66
 Sophronius, bp of Tella (Constantia), ii.3*
 Sozomen, church historian, 6, 20–1, 30, 45
 Spain, 72
 Stephanus, brother of Zachariah, 8
 St Stephen, church, CP, vii.8a*
 St Stephen, relics of, 49, i.0, 1k, 8, ii.5*
 Stephen, *archiatros*, xii.6
 Stephen, bp of Antioch (one or two), 45, iv.12mm, vi.7a
 Stephen, bp of Seleucia Isauria, ix.15a*
 Stephen, *notarius*, 37, viii.5b*
 Stephen, *syncellus*, x.5*
 Stilas, *comes Aegypti*, iv.3a*, 9a
 Stone Quarry, monastery of, see Pesilta
 Succensus, correspondent of Cyril, ix.10a
 Sugha, viii.5c
 Sulifus, Goth, 42, iii.12
 Sunica, chiliarch, ix.3
 Sunitae, xii.7k(iv)*
 Sura, viii.5d*, ix.4*, x.0, 1b, 6
 Syllectus, ix.17c*
 Syncleticus, bp of Tarsus, x.5*
 Symeon Stylites, martyrism of, x.5*
 Symmachus, pope, vii.7b*, 12d, 15
Synekdêmos of Hierocles, xii.7b*
synodos endêmousa, vi.4d*
 Syria, i.9a, ii.0c, iii.10b, viii.5b*
 Syria Prima, province, vii.10c*, viii.5d*
 Syria Secunda, province, v.10a, vii.10c*, viii.5b*
 Syrians, monastery of, Antioch, viii.5c
 Table of Genealogies, i.0, 1j
 Tabriz, viii.5a*
 al-Tafar, commander, ix.2b
 Tamorâyê, vii.6c
 Tannuris, ix.0b, 2, 5, 6b, 17a
 Taphosirion, see Tomb of Osiris
 Țarmel monastery, ix.6d
 Tarsus, v.6f*
 Țayyayê, vii.6b, viii.0, 3a, 5a, ix.2, 6b, 8, 17b, see also Arabs
 Tebetha, ix.0b, 1b, 2a
 Tel'eda, monastery at, viii.5c
 Tell Qeșrê, vii.5a
 Tell Taouil, viii.5c*
 Tella, see Constantia

- Tetrpylon, Alexandria, iv.2a
 Tetrpylon, Amida, x.0, 2
 Thalassius, bp of Caesarea, iii.1e
 Thamudeni, vii.6c*
 Thannuris, see Tannuris
 Thebetha, see Tebetha
 Theocritus, *domesticus*, viii.0, 1b
 Theoctistus, *augustalis*, v.5c
 Theoctistus, *magister officiorum*, v.1a, 4b
 Theodahad, Gothic king, ix.18*
 Theoderic, Gothic king, 55, 67, vi.6e, vii.12d, viii.1a*, x.16b*
 Theodora, empress, insists on execution of Hypatius and Pompey, ix.14b
 protects Miaphysites, 66, 71, ix.15j, x.1c
 invites Severus to CP, ix.15k, 19a
 protects Severus, ix.20
 hears of crimes of Paul the Tabennesiote, x.1d
 mentioned, 37–8, 70, viii.5b*
 Theodore the Apodikanikon, vii.10d, viii.5b*
 Theodore, *augustalis*, vi.2b*, 4a*
 Theodore, bp of Alexandria, iv.1a*
 Theodore, bp of Antinoë, 9, 13, v.5a, 9b*, vi.1ac, 2bc, 4ab
 Theodore, bp of Bostra, x.0, 12
 Theodore, bp of Mopsuestia, 71, iii.1b, vii.7b, 8o, 10b*, 12b*, viii.4d, ix.15h, 21c, 454
 Theodore, envoy to CP, vi.4c*
 Theodore Lector, church historian, 30–1
 Theodore of Ascelon, 8, v.9b, vii.10d
 Theodoret, bp of Cyrrhus, author of *Ecclesiastical History*, 20–1, 30, 33–4, 37, 44–5, 52, 62, i.1i, ii.0a
 deposed at Council of Ephesus (449), iii.1b
 Dioscorus rejects communion with, iii.1j
 condemns Cyril's Twelve Chapters, ii.3, iii.1b
 at Council of Chalcedon, 22, iii.1dej
 rejected as heretic, 71, vii.8o, ix.21c
 works of, 454
 Theodosiopolis (Erzerum), vii.0, 3ab
 Theodosiopolis (Resh'aina), see Resh'aina
 Theodosius, bp of Alexandria, exchanges letters with Severus and Anthimus, 47, 58, ix.0b, 23–6
 summoned to CP, x.1b
 arrives in CP, x.1c
 ordains Jacob and Theodore as bishops, x.12*
 mentioned, ix.16a*, 19b, 20, 22d, x.1d
 Theodosius I, emperor, 66
 Theodosius II, emperor, receives Peter the Iberian as a hostage, iii.4a
 asked to summon council by pope Leo, iv.6b*
 model of orthodoxy, v.2c
 mentioned for dating, 20, 37, 40, 45, i.1k, 9a, ii.0acd, 1, 2a, 4–5, iii.1bf, x.16a*
 mentioned, 41, 49, 67, ii.5
 Theodosius, monk and bp of Jerusalem, replaces Juvenal, iii.0b, 3acd
 ordains Peter the Iberian bp of Gaza, iii.4ab
 ordains Theodore of Joppa, v.4d
 flees Jerusalem, iii.5a
 capture and death, iii.9
 mentioned, iii.10b
 Theodosius, pilgrim, ii.1
 Theodotus, bp of Joppa, v.4d
 Theodotus, *dux*, ix.15b
 Theognostus, *augustalis*, v.6g, 7b
 Theophanes, chronicler, 39–40, 42, 58
 Theophilus, bp, v.3a

- Theophilus, bp of Alexandria, cited,
iv.12wxy
mentioned, v.6g
- Theophilus, deacon, iv.12ff
- Theophilus of Alexandria, Eutychian,
iii.10a*, iv.0bc, 12ahhj
- Theopompus, monk, iv.12ll, v.0a, 1a,
5a
- Theopompus, presbyter, ix.23b
- Theorion, monk, v.1a
- Thilasamon, vii.5b*
- Thiolla, viii.5c*
- Thomas, ambassador, ix.7b
- Thomas, ascetic, vii.4e*
- Thomas, assembly of the apostle
(Emesa), viii.5a
- Thomas bar 'Abdiya, bp of Dara,
vii.6g, viii.5bd*e, ix.15a*
- Thomas, bp of Amida, vii.5e, 6b-f
- Thomas, bp of Amrin, viii.5b
- Thomas, bp of Damascus, viii.5b
- Thomas, bp of Germanicia, viii.5b*c*,
ix.15a*
- Thomas, monastery of apostle
(Seleucia), viii.5bc
- Thomas, *notarius*, 37, viii.5b*
- Thomas of Alexandria, ix.11*, 13e
- Thomas of Bet Nesih, viii.5c
- Thomas, *silentarius*, ix.2a
- Thomas the Armenian, viii.5b*
- Thomas the Tanner, xii.7l
- Thrace, vi.6e, vii.14b*
- Tiberias, viii.3g*
- Tigris, river, vii.4f, ix.5
- Timocletus, author, iv.11b
- Timostratus, general, viii.3a*, ix.1b
- Timothy III, bp of Alexandria, vii.15*,
viii.3g*, 5b, 6
- Timothy I, bp of CP, succeeds to
throne, vii.0, 9
receives letter from Council of
Tyre, vii.10d, 12c
dies, vii.14a
- mentioned, vii.15
- Timothy, correspondent of Paul (NT),
vii.12a, ix.25a
- Timothy Aelurus, bp of Alexandria,
objects to Tome, ii.2d
condemns John the Rhetor, iii.0b
ordained bishop of Alexandria,
iv.0ac, 1a, 5b
seized by Dionysius, iv.1b
baptises children, iv.1c
correspondence with emperor Leo,
25, 51, iv.0b, 5c, 6, 7a
criticised by Anatolius, iv.8a
exiled, iv.0c, 7a, 9
loved by Alexandrians, iv.10c
prolific works of, iv.11b
exposes two Eutychians, iv.12
returns to CP from exile, v.0a, 1a
persuades Basiliscus to issue
Encyclicon, v.1b
addressee of *Encyclicon*, v.2a
signs *Encyclicon*, v.2e
debates with Eutychians, v.4a
moves to Ephesus, v.0b, 4b
returns to Alexandria, v.0b, 4c
in communion with Peter the
Iberian, v.4d
his popularity, v.4ef
dies, v.0c, 5a
author of *Ecclesiastical History*, 24,
52
mentioned, 17–18, 22, 29, 53,
iii.1f*, 10b*, iv.0d, 12mm, v.5ab,
7ade, vi.2b*, 4f, 6c*, 7a
- Timothy, archimandrite, iii.9b*
- Timothy Wobblecap, bp of Alexandria,
replaces Timothy Aelurus, iv.0c,
10
expelled upon Timothy's return,
v.0b, 4c
generously treated by Timothy, v.4e
returns to Alexandria, v.0c, 5c
supporters send mission to CP, v.6e

- dies, v.0d, 7a
 mentioned, iv.0b, mm, v.0b, vi.1c*,
 7a
- Titus, correspondent of Paul (NT),
 vii.12a
- Titus, emperor, ix.17c*
- Tomb of Osiris, 30, iv.1b
- Tome of Leo, 24, 69, ii.2d, iii.0a, 1bfl,
 2a*, 3b, 10a, 11a, iv.0b, 3b,
 5c, 7a, 9b*, 11bc, 12v*, v.0e,
 1b, 2bc, 3b, 4d, 7cde, 8b*, 9b,
 vi.1ac, 2bc, 4b, 6cd, vii.0, 1b,
 8k*o, 10bd, viii.1b, ix.15i, 21bc,
 24c, 25b, 26d
- Totila, Gothic king, 72, x.13b*, 15a*,
 16a*
- Trajan, Column of (Rome), x.16b*
- Trebizond, ix.19ad*
- Tribonian, doctor, ix.6d*, xii.7o*p
- Tribunus, see Tribonian
- Tricamerum, battle, ix.17c*
- Tripolis, Phoenice, 7–8
- Tripyrgion, Amida, vii.4a
- Trisagion, additions to, v.2e*, vii.7b*,
 8b*h*, 9a
- Troy, see Ilium
- Tur Abdin (mountains), ix.5*, x.12*
- Twelve Chapters (Anathemas) of Cyril,
 iii.1b, v.7cde, 8b, vi.2b, vii.10b,
 ix.21b, 22c, 25b, 26d
- Typos* of Anatasius, vii.8k*
- Tyre, Council of (514/15), vii.0, 10de,
 12a
- Tzazon, brother of Gelimer, ix.17b*
- Tzur pass, see Derbent pass
- Ukraine, xii.7k(ix)*
- Ultizurs, steppe people, xii.7k(ix)*
- Unnogur, see Onogur
- Upper Mesopotamia, see Mesopotamia,
 Upper
- Urals, xii.7k(v)*
- Uranius, *agens in rebus*, v.9b, 10a
- Utigurs, steppe people, xii.7k(ix)*
- ‘Uzzai, goddess, viii.5a
- Valamir, Gothic king, iii.12a*, vii.12d*
- Valentinus (Valentinian III), emperor,
 42, 67, ii.4
- Valentinus, heresiarch, iii.9b, ix.22c
- Vandals, 72, ix.17bc, x.16b*
- Veh-az-Amid-Kavadh, vii.4f*
- Verina, empress, iv.8a*, v.1a, 6f*,
 vii.2*
- Vespasian, emperor, ix.17c*, x.16b
- Vigilius, pope, ix.18*
- Vincentius, general, ix.2b
- Vitalian, general, rebels against
 Anastasius, vii.0, 8f*, 13b,
 viii.2a
 captures Hypatius, vii.13ac
 hatred of Severus, viii.2a
 assassinated, viii.0, 2
 mentioned, 58
- Vitalis, author, iv.12q*
- Volga, river, xii.7k(ix)*
- Volusianus, emperor, 40
- Wadiyya, ravine, viii.3e
- Watchtower, monastery of, viii.5c
- Well of Oaths (OT), ix.22a
- Westerners, monastery of, i.9a
- Yazdgerd I, Persian king, ix.6d*
- Yemen, viii.3a*
- Zachariah, author of *Ecclesiastical
 History*, 35, 39, 51, 53, 59–60,
 62, 64–6, 69, ii.5, iii.0a, 1a,
 iv.0a, v.0f, vi.0a, 2a, 7b, x.9
 life of, 3–12
 other works of, 13–28
 at Council of Constantinople (536),
 11–12, ix.19d*
- Zachariah, brother of Procopius of
 Gaza, 9

- Zachariah, OT prophet, viii.7a
 (Mar) Zakkai, monastery, viii.5d
 Zali, Caucasian people, xii.7k(ix)*
 (Mar) Za'ûrâ, gate of, Amida, vii.4g
 Zayd ibn-Ayyub, leader, viii.3d*
 Zeno, emperor, succeeds to throne, v.1a
 overthrows Basiliscus, 26, v.0c, 5a
 threatens Peter Mongus, v.5c
 deposes John Talaia, v.7b
 issues *Henoticon*, 51, 70, v.8
 receives letter from Calendion,
 v.9c
 receives Egyptian delegation, v.0e,
 vi.1c, 2a
 summons Peter the Iberian and
 Isaiah, vi.3
 sends Arsenius to Egypt, vi.4a
 receives Egyptian monks, vi.4c
 sends Theoderic to Italy, ix.18*
 dies, 42, 55, vi.6e, vii.1a
 mentioned for dating, iv.12mm, vi.0,
 7, vii.2a, 3a*, 10a, ix.18
 mentioned, 23, 25, 30, 67, vii.7e,
 8a*, vi.1a, 6c, ix.21b, 25b, 26d
 Zenorodus, lawyer, 9
 Zenodotus, bp, v.3a
 Zenonis, wife of Basiliscus, iv.12mm*,
 v.0b, 1b, 4b
 Ze'ura, holy man, 11, viii.5d*, ix.19a*
 Zilgibi, Hunnic king, vii.3a*
 (Mt) Zion, ix.22d
 Zoilus, bp of Alexandria, x.1d
 Zosimus, historian, 4–5
 Zoticus, bp, v.3a
 Zoticus, city prefect, CP, vii.8d*
 Zrzyrkws, see Geiseric
 Zuqnin chronicle, see Pseudo-
 Dionysius of Tel-Mahre